DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 774 VT 005 226

By- Cohen, Eli E.; And Others

A Demonstration On-The-Job Training Program for Semi-Professional Personnel in Youth Employment Programs. Final Report.

National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency- Office of Manpower, Automation and Training (Dept. of Labor), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.
Report No- 82-31-02
Pub Date 66
Note- 84p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.30
Descriptors- Changing Attitudes, Demonstration Projects, *Educational Programs, Employment Problems, *Employment Programs, Employment Services, *Occupational Information, Personnel Selection, Staff Role, *Subprofessionals, Task Analysis, *Youth Agencies, Youth Employment

To demonstrate the value of employing "indigenous" adults as semi-professional workers in youth employment programs or agencies, this program was conducted between November 1964 and December 1965 in New York City. Sixty male and female adults aged 22 or older were carefully selected, to participate in 12 weeks of training with no guarantee of subsequent employment. Training consisted of a combination of on-the-job training, field trips, and classroom discussion and evaluation. General goals were: (1) identifying tasks that can be performed by semi-professional personnel, (2) developing methods to identify adults who can succeed in this field, (3) developing a training program, and (4) effecting changes in attitudes and degree of involvement on the part of professionals and institutions. Conclusions included: (1) when first hired, the nonprofessional worker needs a highly structured work situation, (2) the nonprofessional should be responsible to only one person in an agency, and (3) professional schools and associations need to explore the problem of professional supervision of nonprofessionals. Appendixes include trainee characteristics, job descriptions, lists of participating agencies, and copies of the training schedule and forms used. (ET)

ED0 24774

A DEMONSTRATION ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

FINAL REPORT

National Committee on Employment of Youth

VT005226

1966-est

FINAL REPORT

A Demonstration On-the-Job Training Program for Semi-Professional Personnel in Youth Employment Programs

National Committee on Employment of Youth
~~145 East 32 Street,~~ New York, ~~New York~~ 10016
N.Y.

Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary
Seymour Lesh, Project Supervisor
Deborah Lesser, Classroom Supervisor
Lazelle D. Alway, Field Supervisor
Louise Greene, Project Secretary

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Contract Number: 82-31-02

This project was conducted from November 24, 1964 to December 24, 1965 under a contract with the United States Department of Labor, Office of Manpower, Automation and Training and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

Note

A nonprofit, nongovernmental agency, the National Committee on Employment of Youth concentrates exclusively on the problems youth face in preparing for and finding work. The Committee monitors national policies and programs, provides research and information about the causes of and ways of dealing with youth unemployment, aids communities to develop and strengthen youth vocational services, deepens public understanding of youth unemployment, and conducts experimental and demonstration programs in the youth employment field.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

A DEMONSTRATION ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SEMI-PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Purpose:	To demonstrate the value of employing "indigenous" adults as semi-professional workers in youth employment programs or agencies.
Population:	60 adults, male and female, age 22 or older, non-or semi-professional, indigenous to a disadvantaged neighborhood or group in New York City, and selected by interview with one staff member and a case conference of entire staff.
Staff:	Staff includes 3-1/3 professional workers from the National Committee on Employment of Youth, an advisory board and special consultants. Additional help is given by outside social agencies.
Curriculum:	Instruction on the "milieu" of disadvantaged youth and barriers to their employment; the role and organization of agencies and programs dealing with youth employment; the types of jobs that can be performed by semi-professional workers within those agencies; the development of communication skills; and problems and experiences encountered on the job.
Program & Methods:	60 adults, in three groups of 20, attend a 12-week training program consisting of a combination of on-the-job training, field trips, and classroom discussion and evaluation.

CONTENTS

Page

NOTE.. ii

PROGRAM SUMMARY... iii

PART I - PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

INTRODUCTION.. 1
EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION FEATURES................. 2
STAFF... 3
RELATIONSHIPS AMONG THE TRAINING STAFF.................. 5
ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND CONSULTANTS...................... 6
THE PROCESS OF RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION
- 1. Recruitment.. 7
- 2. Selection.. 9

TRAINING ALLOWANCES..................................... 14
TESTING... 15
DROPOUTS.. 16
RELATIONSHIP WITH AGENCIES.............................. 18
TRAINING AGENCY AND TRAINING STAFF...................... 21

PART II - CLASSROOM TRAINING

PROGRAM OF TRAINING..................................... 22
DEVELOPMENT OF CURRICULUM............................... 23
THE TRAINING AGENCY AND THE TRAINEE
- 1. Orientation.. 26
- 2. Supervision.. 26
- 3. Agency Services.................................... 27

AUXILIARY SERVICES...................................... 27
METHODOLOGY... 28
THE TRAINING GROUP SESSIONS............................. 30
RESOURCES... 31
TRAINING CONTENT.. 33
REPORTING TECHNIQUES.................................... 34
PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND MATERIAL....................... 36
YOUTH AND THE LABOR MARKET.............................. 37
REMEDIATION TECHNIQUES.................................. 38
INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUES................................. 39
ROLE OF THE PROFESSIONAL IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS... 40
EVALUATION.. 40
TRAINEE EVALUATION...................................... 41
ATTITUDES TOWARD DIDACTIC TRAINING....................... 42

Page

PART III - FIELD TRAINING

FIELD TRIPS.............................. 45
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING...................... 45
JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT............ 49
JOB DESCRIPTIONS......................... 53
CONCLUSION............................... 55

APPENDICES

APPENDIX "A"

Interview Schedule....................... 59
Interviewer's Case Summary............... 65

APPENDIX "B"

Training Schedule........................ 66

APPENDIX "C"

Agencies Providing On-the-Job Stations......... 68
Agencies Providing Full-Time Jobs.............. 69

APPENDIX "D"

Statistics............................... 70

APPENDIX "E"

Job Descriptions......................... 72

PART I - PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

The establishment of youth employment programs by the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training, and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency & Youth Development, uncovered great potential for new occupations in youth-serving agencies. With the advent of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Vocational Education Act, and other legislation, the potential multiplied. New concepts were fostered that called for changes in existing patterns of work in the human relations field. Among the more important was the recognition that people without formal professional training could contribute significantly to the operation of youth-serving agencies.

The National Committee on Employment of Youth was in the forefront of this movement, as it believed that the use of nonprofessionals could bring about better services, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to youth in need of help. However, NCEY also foresaw possible dangers if such personnel were "turned loose" without any training.

We therefore proposed to train a number of nonprofessionals in an experimental setting to develop techniques for their selection, training and placement which might be utilized by other programs and agencies. We felt that the successful use of such trained personnel could have beneficial effects on the field of youth employment. First, it could help relieve the growing shortage of professional workers by allowing existing professional workers to use their unique skills more fully. Second, it could create new levels of jobs for many different kinds of people who can contribute valuably to the field. And third, it could result in increased services to youth in need of help.

The program was based upon a number of hypotheses:

1) That people indigenous to a disadvantaged neighborhood or group could establish rapport with youth from similar circumstances more easily than could professionals with a middle-class orientation;

2) That they would be trusted by the youth to a greater extent than the professionals might be;

3) That such people would have first-hand knowledge of the problems and needs of unemployed youth;

4) That they would have had practical experience in dealing with the agencies and power structure in their communities;

5) That they could handle, in a more subjective way, those problems which have not been amenable to solution by the professional worker's objectivity.

To augment these inherent attributes, NCEY proposed to provide the semi-professional* with (1) background material - the causes of youth employment problems; (2) methods for dealing with youth in different situations - techniques of interviewing, remediation, observation, counseling and reporting; and (3) group dynamics - leading discussion groups, group counseling, leadership development and problem solving. In addition, information about community resources, which could be passed on to youth and their families and utilized in meeting daily crises, would be provided. Agency structure and goals, and the role of the professional workers would also be examined. Finally, it was felt that a practical application - on-the-job training - would synthesize the more didactic aspects of the training and illustrate to the students their own roles within an agency structure.

It was proposed that NCEY train sixty adults (22 years of age and older) in three sequential groups of twenty each.

The Experimental and Demonstration Features

The initial focus of the project was based upon NCEY's knowledge and experience with youth employment programs throughout the country.** We had found that more and more programs were using subprofessionals to supplement the work of their professional staffs; however, few were providing any systematic training. NCEY was concerned lest the services rendered to youth be reduced in quality. As the training program progressed, these purposes were enlarged and refined to include new elements that came to light.

---

*Note: Throughout this report the terms "semi-professional," "nonprofessional" and "subprofessional" will be used interchangeably.

**See National Committee on Employment of Youth, Youth Employment Programs in Perspective, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare, Office of Juvenile Delinquency & Youth Development, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

The final enumeration of the experimental and demonstration features was as follows:

- A. Identifying those tasks within agencies that can be performed by semi-professional personnel.
    - 1. Evaluating the role of the professional.
    - 2. Isolating those tasks done by the professional that are nonprofessional in nature.
    - 3. Developing job descriptions for these tasks.
- B. Developing methods to identify those adults who can succeed in this field.
- C. Developing a training program that will insure the greatest opportunities for success.
    - 1. Devising a classroom curriculum that will meet requirements of the jobs to be performed.
    - 2. Developing training stations that will offer the best types of learning experiences.
    - 3. Integrating the classroom and on-the-job training so that optimum learning takes place.
- D. Effecting changes in attitudes and degree of involvement on the part of professionals and institutions.

Each of these features is discussed in detail under the appropriate sections of the report. Wherever possible the process of trial and error and change is described so that other programs may benefit from our mistakes as well as from our successes. Hopefully, this will help eliminate some groping in the development of viable programs.

Staff

Under the terms of the contract, the Executive Secretary of NCEY devoted one-third of his time to the project. In addition, three full-time professionals were designated to staff the program: (1) Project Supervisor; (2) Field Supervisor; (3) Classroom Supervisor.

The Project and Field Supervisors were already employees of NCEY, thus the major task at the beginning of the project was the selection of a Classroom Supervisor. Much difficulty was encountered in locating and hiring a person with the background we deemed essential. Since the training itself was to be flexible and innovative, we sought the kind of person who would respond to the needs of the trainees and not be chained to a lesson plan. Because of the time of year, the relatively brief length of the contract, and the general shortage of such people, it took the better part of a month before someone could be hired.

While this person seemed to have the desired experience and knowledge it was evident when classes started that flexibility was missing. Part of this must be attributed to the lack of time devoted to staff training and orientation. So many other priorities had to be considered in so brief a period that just handling them interfered with providing the necessary staff preparation. It is our view now that some of the other priorities should have been postponed in favor of staff training, since the classroom work is the heart of the program.

Toward the end of the first training group the Classroom Supervisor became ill. Thus during the last three weeks classroom work was handled by the Project and Field Supervisors. This, of course, detracted from their regular functions and affected the operation of the program. When it became obvious that the Classroom Supervisor would not be returning, we were faced with another hiring problem. Fortunately we were able to find someone before the second group started. This person had been helpful to the program in a consultant capacity and had led a number of discussions with the first group. She had excellent skills and since she was familiar with the program, needed little in the way of orientation and training. Moreover, she had the flexibility and innovativeness we had so desperately sought in our initial selection. From the moment of her employment, the program took on a more exciting and meaningful focus and the second and third training groups benefited immeasurably more than had the first group.

As the program progressed and as staff became familiar with each other's style, the program operated on a smoother and more efficient basis. Part of this came from a more explicit definition of each staff member's role and from the increased delegation by the Project Supervisor of many tasks he formerly handled.

The lesson learned from our experience, while not unique, may be helpful to other programs - adequate time should be spent at the beginning of a new project for staff orientation and training. The goals of the program and the nature of each staff member's responsibility and role must be understood. And this should be done even at the expense of some of the more practical needs of the program. The successful operation of any program depends upon the people who are staffing it and not upon materials, supplies, or forms. The willingness and freedom of staff to discuss problems, to disagree, to haggle if necessary, is mandatory in any innovative or creative process.

Relationships Among the Training Staff

While there is no question that staff orientation would have alleviated many of the initial difficulties, there is no assurance that a smoothly operating project would have been thus guaranteed. Staff orientation can rarely, if ever, provide the means for dealing with those personality factors that determine the manner in which one person deals with another or perceives his role in interpersonal relationships. It was clearly these personality factors that caused intra-staff problems above and beyond those that training might have resolved.

At all times, lines of communication among staff members were kept open. The way they were utilized depended largely on each staff member's needs and his approach to filling those needs. In one case, staff members had constant exchanges of views; in another case, a staff member waited to be "consulted" or "asked." The rapid pace of the program and myriad jobs to be done generally precluded the formality of staff meetings; perhaps time should have been made for such meetings to ensure that all staff members were provided a specific forum in which to express their ideas.

Overlapping of responsibility created another problem. Since all staff members had established a variety of contacts with cooperating agency personnel, the operations of the Field Supervisor were often limited by other staff members who felt it important to utilize contacts they had establised. This made for some discontinuity and, on occasion, a source of friction.

In the main, however, relationships among staff were excellent. There was great interchange of ideas, which made for broader perspective to each job and, in turn, to the project as a whole.

Advisory Committee and Consultants

A program Advisory Committee was selected in December 1964 to review the plans already made by NCEY and to suggest approaches and techniques to be utilized before the actual training started in January of 1965.* An all-day meeting was held in which the Committee counseled and advised NCEY staff on the recruitment and selection process, the types of jobs we might aim at developing for the trainees, the timing and sequence of each training section, the techniques that could be used in training, and the specific details of what should be covered in the curriculum.

The Committee proved invaluable to the operation of the program. Although not every approach they recommended was adopted by NCEY, many were. Numerous pitfalls were avoided because members of the Committee could draw upon their own experiences and knowledge of training, counseling, program theory and operation. At the conclusion of the meeting, after almost seven hours of constant give-and-take, haggling, arguing and defending, NCEY staff was admonished to "be bold rather than cautious!"

Unfortunately, because of budget restrictions, we were not able to continue formal meetings of the Advisory Committee. Instead, we called upon members individually during the course of the program when specific advice and help was needed, and they responded with enthusiasm and interest.

Consultants were utilized as additional classroom instructors throughout the program. They were selected on the basis of their particular knowledge of specific curriculum areas, specialized experiences, and ability to communicate these factors to the trainees. We were extremely fortunate in being able to recruit people with all the sought-after attributes. While they differed in approach and theory, they gave the program new dimensions and added flexibility.

---

*The members of the Advisory Committee were: Dr. Dan Dodson, Center for Human Development, New York University; Dr. Jean Gilbert, Dept. of Guidance and Personnel, New York University; Dr. Martin Hamburger, Dept. of Guidance and Personnel, New York University; Mr. Harry Link, Director, PAL-JOEY; Mr. Norman Perlstein, Director, Brotherhood-In-Action; Mr. Manuel Romero, Director, Urban League-HARYOU Center; Dr. Herman Slotkin, Coordinator, Umbrella Project, New York City Board of Education.

Their influence as a group on the trainees was dramatic: They represented the professional disciplines with which the trainees would work; they clearly indicated how different professions deal with problems; and they reaffirmed the trainees' faith in "do-gooders." One of the most unexpected outcomes was the direct influence the consultants had on the trainees' desire to continue with and further their own formal schooling; the consultants had become role models. As one trainee commented, he had looked upon professionals as "self-centered snobs who just throw big words at you." After exposure to the consultant-speakers he observed that, "These people really care about kids and they are trying to help them. They made me see for the first time how little I know."

The Process of Recruitment and Selection

1. Recruitment

With the recommendations of the Advisory Committee and other consultants, NCEY explored various ways in which trainees might be recruited and most effectively (in terms of staff time and capability) selected.

The contract had indicated recruiting a number of trainees from outside New York City and later assigning them to on-the-job training stations in their home communities. However, after deliberation, the conclusion was reached that this system would require too much staff time being spent away from the central program. Such a situation would make it extremely difficult to conduct adequate on-the-job counseling, placement and follow-up activities. It was decided therefore to confine the recruitment (and on-the-job training) to the Greater New York City area.

In accordance with the contract specifications, NCEY approached the New York State Employment Service for help in recruitment of trainees. When we indicated to the Employment Service that the major focus would be on people indigenous to disadvantaged groups or neighborhoods in New York City - that is, that most would be members of minority groups - we were told that this would be discrimination against middle-class, white applicants and that no requirements as to race, ethnicity or income could be handled by the Employment Service. At this point we became concerned that we would be forced to interview a great many people who did not meet the established criteria. This would take a great deal of time and be unfair to those whom we had no intention of enrolling, yet whom we would have to interview. After some discussion, a decision was reached whereby we would utilize only one office of the Employment Service rather than soliciting referrals from all offices. Because of patterns of housing and discrimination, the population served by this particular office was almost wholly Negro and Puerto Rican. We anticipated that about one-half of all trainees would be selected from this Employment Service office.

To assure the recruitment of people with a wide variety of educational and experiential backgrounds, we decided to recruit the other trainees from different social agencies in New York City. Approximately fifty agencies were solicited by mail - the program was described, the criteria for selection were explained and referral forms were sent out. Then staff settled back to await the expected deluge of applicants. Much to our surprise (and shock), the referrals did not materialize in any appreciable number. Only the Employment Service was able to refer the number of people we requested. The other social agencies, except in one or two instances, seemed to have ignored our request.

We then began a follow-up by telephone of all the agencies previously contacted by mail. This produced only limited results, but it did lead to suggestions by agency people that we visit them to discuss the program in detail. These interviews proved to be highly successful since time could be spent on not only how our program would operate and the needed referrals, but also on how the agencies might participate as possible on-the-job training stations. The visits gave NCEY staff an opportunity to meet potential supervisors and observe the functions and physical plants of the agencies. The program, in effect, had to be "sold" in individual meetings with agency personnel. While this approach was initially time consuming, it eliminated a great many problems and misunderstandings that did in fact occur with those agencies contacted only by phone or mail.

The objective in using other agencies to refer applicants was to provide NCEY with a preliminary screening device. This allowed us to concentrate on developing and refining the intake questionnaire. The assumption was that agencies would refer those persons with whom they had prior contact and whom they believed could work well with youth. This kind of referral involved the referring agency in the program to a greater extent than one might expect. Many agencies offered additional help and support to the program after having made referrals; many of those agencies that did not refer anyone did provide suggestions, consultation, training stations and full-time employment opportunities.

Peripheral problems were encountered all through the recruitment phases. These generally had to do with referring people ineligible for the program because of age or other factors. When such problems were discussed with agency personnel it was found that although they were aware of our age restriction (22 years and older), they felt that someone who was 21 but, in their eyes, eminently qualified should not be screened out. Two applicants were referred to us with instructions to give false ages in order to be eligible for the program. This was discovered in preliminary conversation and they were rejected. However, it is possible that one or more applicants succeeded in fooling us on this point.

Another recruitment problem, particularly in the second and third training groups, had to do with the sex of the trainees. Upon completion of the first training section, and during placement efforts for this group, agencies informed us of the need for additional male nonprofessionals; women were not in short supply. Agencies preferred males for work with teenage boys in high-risk areas. There was also a need for people who would work nights in these areas, a provision with which most women could not or would not comply. Yet despite repeated requests for males, the majority of applicants sent by the referring agencies were female. At first, NCEY thought of making its screening requirements higher for women than for men, but upon further consideration we felt to do so would be contrary to the program's purpose - to select people based upon our estimate of their individual capabilities.

In analyzing the types of referrals from different agencies, NCEY was surprised to find that people referred by the New York State Employment Service were on a par with people referred by the social agencies. We attribute this to the close working relationship with one highly qualified and interested Employment Service Counselor through whom all referrals were channeled. This relationship prevented many problems at the source.

2. Selection

During the initial recruitment process NCEY worked with one of its consultants on the design of a screening instrument. The purpose of the instrument was to identify, as accurately as possible, those characteristics we had posited for potential success in the field. We were hoping to use the instrument to identify applicants who want to be engaged in society;

who stand out as a father, mother or family member; who indicate a liking for youth; who have maintained contact with their neighborhood and community; who have attachment toward people rather than disattachment; who have potential leadership qualities; and who have a reasonable measure of social maturity. We were not searching for indications of intellectual accomplishment.

A preliminary document was drawn up, revised and tested on the first four applicants. The results were then discussed with the consultant to see if we had achieved our purposes. Because of the pressure of time and the need to interview and enroll people for the program quickly, we were unable to continue an ongoing revision of the instrument and had to depend upon what we had developed up to that time. The same problems prevented us from making revisions with each of the two following groups.

The interviews lasted from one to one-and-a-half hours. After each applicant was interviewed, the interviewer prepared a summary, and a case conference was held with all staff. The interviewer presented the data and answered questions posed by the other staff members relating to the applicant's characteristics and background. A decision was then reached by all staff whether to accept the applicant. In a few cases it was felt that a second interview was necessary to clear up certain questions and the applicants were recalled and interviewed by a different staff member. Since the program was experimental, a number of applicants were accepted although the staff felt that there were good possibilities they would not succeed.

The basic selection criteria were left as flexible as possible, within the restrictions of the contract. They were:

Age: 22 years and older - no upper age limit

Sex: Male or female.

Education: No minimum educational requirements - ability to read, write and speak English well enough to communicate with professional staff and youth.

Personal: Those characteristics that indicate a desire and ability to work with youth.

Other restrictions applied to eligibility for training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act. They did, in fact, prohibit a number of people from enrolling in the program whom we thought were excellent candidates. By the time the third training group started, the Act had been amended and the criteria were eased considerably. (NCEY,along with other projects in similar circumstances, was instrumental in getting the MDTA broadened to include coverage of people who had been previously ineligible for training allowances.)

A short situational reading test was administered to the first group of applicants. During the course of their training it became evident that we needed to know more about reading, writing, and comprehension levels before the training started. For the second and third applicant groups, we added a brief dictation test, which included much of the jargon used in the field, and a current events article to test reading comprehension. While these tests took place during the screening interviews, they were not used in the selection process, but rather as a guide for including remedial work in the curriculum.

Comparatively few applicants were interviewed in order to select the trainees. For the first group, thirty applicants were interviewed and twenty-one selected; for the second group, thirty were interviewed and twenty selected; for the third group, thirty-seven applicants were interviewed to select the twenty to be enrolled. This rather small ratio of people interviewed to people selected (97:62) was due, in part, to the quality of referrals by most participating agencies, and, in part, to the flexible selection criteria used by NCEY. People were screened out on the basis of the staff's impressions of the applicant's inability to work with people and not upon educational or experiential factors. Attitude, maturity and motivation were the key elements sought. Those rejected were referred to other training programs or were told to return to their referring agencies.

Many potential applicants were turned down over the telephone when they did not meet the initial selection criteria. As noted earlier, agencies sometimes ignored the criteria and some referred anyone with whom they came into contact. We found that having referring agencies tell their people to telephone for an appointment saved an enormous amount of time. We were able to reject quickly those not meeting the criteria; this allowed us to use our interviewing time more productively.

During the training of the first group, an attempt was made to develop attitude scales that could be used in the initial selection process to reveal the factors that might make for success in the field. Our first step was to identify those members of the training group whom we felt had the most potential. Next we tried to identify the characteristics these people had in common. Our final step was to compare their answers to certain questions on the screening instrument with those of trainees we felt were not doing as well, to see if there were any measurable differences.

We had no trouble in identifying the more capable members of the training group; after six weeks in intensive classroom and on-the-job situations, we knew them well enough to make specific, although admittedly subjective, judgments. Once we had accomplished this, we were also able to identify those characteristics which differentiated them from the other trainees. In doing this, we tried to eliminate such factors as attentiveness in class, politeness and appearance, since we wanted to avoid selecting traits that might characterize "teacher's pets" and nothing more. The traits isolated were:

(1) Enough maturity as evidenced by the poise, self-confidence, and attitude of an adult willing to recognize his personal problems and needs without allowing them to overwhelm him.

(2) A degree of motivation (very closely connected to the maturity cited above) which, upon acceptance of an idea or situation, culminates in a commitment to and involvement with that idea or situation.

(3) Good inter-personal relations. An ability to relate to many different kinds of people. A feeling for people. Consideration for others.

(4) A degree of inquisitiveness and enthusiasm, which leads the trainee to explore unknown areas and to take some initiative in that exploration.

(5) Good communication skills, particularly the ability to speak so that others, including professionals, will understand and listen.

(6) A degree of competence or native intelligence, which enables the trainee to perform basic or simple office tasks without extensive training or supervision.

These characteristics were drawn from a composite of the selected trainees. No single trainee had all and no single trainee had none of these characteristics.

It was after this stage in the development of the attitude scales that we hit a blank wall. A change of staff had to be made, causing a delay in going ahead with the development of the scales. Later, in order to save as much time as possible, we looked for standardized tests that would quantify the identified characteristics. The tests we investigated seemed to provide only gross indices and did not appear applicable to the kind of people we were training. Neither was the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) which most of the applicants referred by the Employment Service had been given.

Sometime later, we analysed the intake questionnaires of all the trainees in the first group and selected those questions we felt would indicate the factors noted above. However, we could find no meaningful differences in answers between those trainees we had chosen as having the desired traits and those not having them. Moreover, another factor was uncovered: A number of the trainees had not answered the questions on the screening instrument as truthfully as they might have. There were obvious discrepancies between their answers and what had come to light in classroom discussions. We then decided to postpone the development of the attitude scales until we could find another approach. As an alternative, we have now revised the intake instrument based solely upon our perceptions of the trainees and their characteristics (See Appendix _A_).

One of the dangers inherent in the selection process is to allow the training facility to become agency-centered rather than trainee-centered. It is tempting to let agencies tell you the kinds of people they will take for on-the-job training and final placement. It is harder to get agencies to create the types of jobs and training situations that would be of most help to the people being trained. Eventually, if agencies are allowed to make these decisions, the selection process will be affected and the target group will be slighted or abandoned.

In accordance with the experimental and demonstration features of the program, the trainees recruited and selected represented a wide range of age, education and experience. We had hypothesized that many different kinds of people could be trained for work in the youth employment field, and that all of them could contribute valuably no matter what had been their experience and achievement in the past. Education, in particular, was left flexible, since it had been and continues to be one of the major barriers to obtaining work in most of the helping professions.

The concept of semi-professional or nonprofessional worker means different things to different people. To some of the professionals with whom we dealt, it meant a person who had a bachelor's degree, a major in one of the social sciences, some related work experience and a stated desire to work for an advanced degree. Happily, there are enough professionals and agencies who are willing to accept workers with far less in the way of education, provided they have had some training.

Results of performance on full-time jobs seems to indicate that formal education should not be used as a criterion for selection. The correlation between education and performance on the job appears to be inconclusive. Trainees with higher levels of education are doing well on the job. Those with less formal education, however, also are doing well. This seems to indicate that while education is helpful, there are other, more pertinent, factors that lead to satisfactory job performance. An alternate correlation seems to be a great deal more operable; that is, when a trainee has been hired by an agency and performs well on the job, he is then more likely to seek formal training for upgrading in the field, even to the professional level.

Training Allowances

When the Manpower Development and Training Act was being drafted, it was obvious to the legislative designers that training alone would not attract the hard-core unemployed, the underemployed or those members of society who had been relegated to the fringes of the economy. They recognized that training, to be effective, must operate in an atmosphere where personal problems are held to a minimum. One of the ways in which this was accomplished was by offering a training allowance as a substitute for unemployment insurance, welfare assistance or present earnings. This permitted many people to take training who ordinarily would not be able to afford it. However, as already noted, a number of restrictions were placed on the eligibility criteria. These had to do with the number of dependents one had or the employment status of the head of the family and, in effect, discriminated against single people with no dependents. In discussions with potential employers, it was often this very group they preferred since such workers could more easily accept odd arrangements of work hours.

NCEY enrolled a number of people in its first section who did not meet the eligibility requirements for receiving an allowance. We were able to obtain "scholarship" funds from a number of interested people, which enabled the trainees to remain in the program. However, we could not continue this for the second section.

When the Manpower Development and Training Act was amended in the summer of 1965, providing for expanded coverage of and increased allowances to trainees, it became possible to enroll people in the third section who would have been ineligible in the first.

Payments of training allowances are handled by a special unit of the New York State Employment Service, and we experienced great difficulty with it. There is a delay of up to three weeks before trainees receive their first checks. This poses an enormous problem to the majority of people, who have been unemployed for some time prior to the training and can least afford to wait. For many of our trainees it meant a period of going without meals, without necessary clothing, and of stalling the landlord, telephone, gas and electric companies, et al. When the checks did begin to come in, the trainees were so far behind in paying their bills that the three-week gap in payments continued throughout the program. In addition, during each of the three training sections there were periods of from one to three weeks when checks were delayed for no apparent reason. This, too, posed many hardships for the trainees and was the chief reason for most of the threats by trainees to drop out of the program. NCEY loaned money in a number of cases, but funds were limited, and as of this writing (Jan. 1966), money lent out in August of 1965 has still not be returned.

Some of the present procedures must be streamlined when dealing with the poor. There should be a method for speeding up payments or providing a contingency fund for people who have little or no resources on which to draw. The poor have no backlog of funds and can turn to few people for help. The present system of payment assumes an ability to wait that does not exist. When people are willing to skip meals in order to take training, it is a sign of tremendous motivation, but empty bellies do not enhance learning.

Testing

No testing was undertaken with the first group of trainees. A battery of tests (Interpersonal Values, Temperament, Reading Ability and Mental Alertness) was administered to the second and third groups and their reactions to testing procedure were explored. After giving these tests, a trained vocational and psychological testing specialist spoke about the role of testing in a counseling situation and explored the reactions to tests which differed greatly among the trainees. Group II was much more suspicious of the tests than Group III and retained its mistrust long after the tests had been given, scored and the results distributed. There is little question that the attitude toward the tests of the person administering them was transmitted to the group. When first used, the staff was anxious to see what the tests would reveal about the group. No doubt the group sensed this and resented being "examined." After seeing the results, staff realized that the group had shown us something about the tests as well as about themselves, and it was in this spirit that they were used with the next group, whose reaction was understandably more accepting and adventuresome.

The tests given to both groups provided the staff with a normal distribution of responses. In only one case did a trainee's scores in any way indicate the existence of an erratic pattern of response. In several other cases the tests did not bring to light disturbances known to staff. We do not believe that the tests used, with the exception of the Gates Reading Survey, which is itself limited in usefulness, provided us with reliable, useful or necessary information about the trainees. We would recommend therefore that until new tests are developed, specifically designed for use with disadvantaged minority groups, programs use existing tests with caution or only as demonstrations to show what tests in current use are like.

Dropouts

Most MDTA and other training programs have been concerned with controlling the number of dropouts from their projects. Part of this concern has to do with the difficulties encountered in replacing people in the middle of a cycle of training without disrupting the rest of the class. When NCEY designed its program it was noted by staff that there would be little or no opportunity to replace people who dropped out after the program started. The format of the program precluded this. At the same time, we were warned by our Advisory Committee and by a number of program people that we should expect a 40 to 60 percent dropout rate. Staff felt that such a rate would wreck the program, yet we could see no way of altering the format to allow for dropouts and, at the same time, ensure the kind of training we thought essential. We started the first training section with fingers crossed.

In all, we enrolled sixty-one people in the three training sections. Two trainees were dropped by NCEY* and fifty-nine completed the training. Despite serious financial difficulties, personal problems, lack of job guarantees, and dissatisfaction with parts of the training, the program's holding power exceeded everyone's expectations. There were no voluntary dropouts!

We can only speculate about the reasons for this holding power. It is probably due to a combination of two or more factors, some of which are posited below:

(1) The quality of referrals from participating agencies.

(2) An intake process which eliminated those people with gross deficiencies and may have caused those selected to think about themselves more favorably.

(3) The immeasureable intensity of desire of people to upgrade themselves and learn new skills when given opportunities.

(4) The atmosphere in the classroom, which permitted trainees to express both positive and negative feelings without fear of recrimination.

(5) The approach taken by staff that the trainees were adults and could face up to adverse criticism if presented honestly and from an obvious desire to help.

(6) The provision of auxiliary counseling services and a system of referrals to handle those problems of a personal nature with which NCEY could not deal.

(7) The trainees' direct experience of working with disadvantaged youth and seeing how interesting and rewarding such experience can be.

The single reason which might have led to most dropping out was money problems. As mentioned before they included a delay before the first checks were received, delays in subsequent checks, the ineligibility of some trainees for any allowance at all, the possibility of eviction for unpaid rent, and the resulting necessity of some trainees to skip lunches in order to make ends meet. This was compounded by the factor that was stressed throughout the program that we could not guarantee jobs upon completion of the training.

---

*One trainee was dropped for inability to perform even simple tasks, and the other trainee because of a severe personality disorder.

The filling out of all necessary employment service and training allowance forms was deliberately scheduled for the second day of training rather than the first. We felt that one day should be devoted to allowing the trainees to get to know each other, the staff and the general program outline. This seemed to work well: In all three sections a "group" atmosphere was achieved during the first day and trainees were then ready to withstand what they saw as the degrading procedure of proving that they needed and were eligible for allowances.

Another factor concerning staff was that perhaps the program was overprotective or too paternalistic, and that this accounted for its holding power. However, since most trainees have obtained jobs in the field and are performing well, whatever paternalism existed seems to have been beneficial.

Staff recognizes that a number of other people probably should have been dropped by us from the program. As was noted earlier, a few were enrolled with the knowledge that there was a good possibility they would not succeed. We were concerned that in order to achieve "success" we might tend to "cream." However, by keeping these people in the program we may have been fostering a self-fulfilling prophecy; most of those whom we predicted might not succeed, are not succeeding. But on the other hand, two of them are doing well on the job. The trainees who came under this category, however, were told before they completed training that we would have difficulty in recommending them for jobs in the field. Another reason for not dropping more people was the then unconscious but now recognizable desire to show how good the program was.

Relationship with Agencies

The key element to any success we have achieved has been the cooperation of other agencies in their referral, on-the-job training and final-placement activities. Their willingness to accept the concept of "indigenous nonprofessional" made all other problems relatively routine. There were moments of frustration, disagreement and outright malevolence on the part of some agencies toward the use of nonprofessionals but, in the main, most agencies were willing to listen, and a great many did more than that.

There was genuine interest and concern by professionals and agencies providing on-the-job training stations. This is illustrated very clearly by the following:

In order to evaluate the training program more objectively and to improve communications with participating agencies, two meetings were held - one in March and one in June, 1965 - with agency directors, supervisors and other concerned people. We hoped to hold these meetings during regular working hours, but found that we could not set a mutually satisfactory day or hour. As an alternative we offered to hold the meetings in the evening, and this appeared to be acceptable. Since we doubted that many people would come on their own time after putting in a full day's work, we were prepared for a small turnout.

Much to our astonishment and pleasure thirty people arrived for the first meeting and twenty-seven for the second. Considering that we had only twenty people in training on each of those dates, the turnout was more than we could possibly have hoped for. Representatives from the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training came and contributed greatly to the discussions. There seemed to be a feeling by the participants that such meetings should be held more often to provide for better coordination of the classroom and on-the-job training experiences. Unfortunately, their continuance was limited because the cost of holding such meetings could not be borne under the contract and had to be financed solely by NCEY.

Out of these meetings came many suggestions and recommendations. Some of the proposals were conflicting, but quite a few were incorporated in the program. The meetings were also an educational experience for NCEY staff and led to better relationships with agencies and their personnel.

The chief problem among agency personnel has been in developing adequate means and techniques for supervising semi-professionals. While NCEY developed some guidelines for this kind of supervision, it still remains an area needing much study and work.

One of our more difficult problems was the pressure placed upon us by agencies wanting to increase the trainees' time spent on the job or to alter the days of the week when trainees would work in their programs. During the first training section we acceded to the requests of the agencies. However, as it disrupted the scheduled classroom work and lowered the morale of trainees, we insisted in the second and third groups upon agency acceptance of our schedule prior to sending them trainees, and we resisted most requests to make changes. In only one case did we make an exception for half a day, and that was when many agency staff were ill and someone had to escort a Job Corps enrollee to an airport.

This insistence on a rather rigid schedule regularized the trainees' time in their agencies, and, for the most part, prevented their being used as extra hands to fill in during emergencies. It also meant that agencies could count on the trainees' regular appearance and be able to plan their work well in advance.

We experienced the whole range of agency attitudes, from outright hostility to unquestioning acceptance. However, most response to the program fell between these extremes. Those agencies which evidenced extremely negative attitudes towards nonprofessionals were deliberately not involved in the program since time did not permit extended efforts to persuade them. However, specific professionals within such agencies were notified about the progress of the program. Often, it was a matter of their waiting to see what happened in other agencies before committing themselves one way or another. Many professionals did, in fact, change their outlook.

Dealings with Federal, state and local government agencies was a large aspect of the program. From one standpoint we were impressed by the interest and dedication of most of the agencies and personnel with whom we had contact. Their specific help and advice were extremely useful. Many went out of their way to see that the program did not flounder and that proper procedure was adhered to. However, in retrospect, much of their help was in dealing with their own regulations and red tape and consequently one wonders if there are too many forms, reports, and pieces of paper to be filled in and mailed; too many documents to sign in five, ten, and fifteen copies; too much delay in getting approval for equipment, activities and expenditures, and too much wasted staff time in dealing with government agencies. Since we are not in a position to judge whether the forms and reports are necessary, inevitably our initial reaction is one of resentment. We suggest that if the agencies which require these forms and reports did a better job of explaining their function and importance, they would get better cooperation.

Training Agency and Training Staff

As has been noted, three of the four members of the project staff were recruited directly from NCEY's personnel. Once the training was underway these staff members were totally involved in the project rather than in the ongoing work of the agency. Communication was regular between the training facility and regular NCEY staff, and we called extensively, as had been planned, upon the agency's unique knowledge, resources and personnel capabilities in the implementation of the program.

PART II - CLASSROOM TRAINING

Program of Training

With the help and advice of the Advisory Commitee and a number of consultants, an outline of training for the first section was developed. It was designed to provide an integrated program of classroom and field experience.

The first training section ran for thirteen weeks in the following pattern:

(a) Two weeks - full time in the classroom

(b) Ten weeks - Mondays - total group met in the classroom

Tuesday & Wednesday - Half the trainees remained in the classroom; the other half were on the job

Thursday & Friday - groups exchanged positions

(c) One week - full time in the classroom

During the course of training for the first group and upon evaluating its efficiency at the end of the thirteen weeks, it became obvious that this pattern was not working properly and needed extensive revision.

The trainees themselves recommended drastic changes. They did not want to separate into two groups for a number of reasons. First, each of the groups felt they were not getting the same kinds of material in their classroom work; petty jealousies and recriminations began to come to light. Secondly, the feeling of being a "group," which had grown during the first two weeks of training, was being destroyed and, with it, individual morale. Finally, having to repeat the same materials to two separate groups was an obvious waste of staff time; it prevented intensive follow-up activities on the job and took away from planning time. Agency personnel also indicated that they would like to have the trainees on the job more than two days a week, and that Friday was not a good day for them to conduct on-the-job training.

With all these factors in mind, the sequence of training was changed to provide a closer relationship between classroom work and on-the-job training, and to tighten the administrative functions. For the second and third training sections the program was cut to twelve weeks in the following manner:

(a) Two weeks - full time in the classroom

(b) Three weeks - Monday, Wednesday & Friday - in the classroom

Tuesday & Thursday - on the job

(c) Six weeks - Monday & Friday in the classroom

Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday - on the job

(d) One week - full time in the classroom

This schedule worked to the advantage of the trainees, the agencies and NCEY staff. It eliminated most of the problems encountered during the first training section. The trainees benefited because they all participated in the same classroom work and had the opportunity to hear about everyone else's on-the-job experiences. The agencies benefited because they had a greater block of time to devote to training on the days when they were best equipped to handle it. NCEY staff benefited from the extra "breathing space," which we utilized to evaluate progress and plan for the future.

Development of Curriculum

Since we could find no formal curriculum that had been developed by other programs, schools or groups dealing with the training of nonprofessionals in the human relations field, we had to proceed on a hit-or-miss basis, trying what we thought would work, adapting old material to new situations, and innovating wherever possible. The first training section was the testing-out group and sometimes suffered because of it. Many techniques and much material had to be discarded after being tried out.

Then, too, when one approach was found to work well, it was often over-used to the detriment of other possible approaches. For example, during the first training section we found that role-playing situations produced great interest and involvement from trainees. We were soon using it for almost every phase of the curriculum and the spark was lost. The trainees grew bored with it and complained constantly that they weren't learning anything. However, staff learned and role-playing for the second and third groups was utilized very carefully and only in situations that had meaning for the trainees.

Of great help in developing and improving the curriculum were the outside speakers (consultants) who recommended areas for further development and different approaches that might be utilized. Clues were also obtained from their discussions with the trainees, the types of questions asked by trainees, and the obvious shortcomings in the presented material.

The trainees themselves were called on to suggest topics they wanted to know more about and which they felt were related to the over-all program. One such need arose in the third training session when the trainees suggested they learn some elementary Spanish in order to cope better with the problem of non-English-speaking youth. This was highly successful. However, many other suggestions made were impractical and unrelated, so that care had to be taken in evaluating their requests.

It has proven difficult to set down a detailed description of each part of the curriculum, since so much of the material and its presentation depended upon staff's perceptions of the trainees' needs at particular times. With one group we found it necessary to stress and repeat certain material while another group was ready to move on to other topics after only a brief, cursory look at that material.

So much, in this kind of training, depends upon the relationship between the Classroom Supervisor and the trainees and upon an atmosphere which is at once flexible and demanding. Broad subject areas were identified and adapted, but within these areas there was great leeway in how the material would be presented, by whom, and for how long. An intuitive awareness of what was needed at what moment was necessary to use curriculum materials properly. The Classroom Supervisor would go into the class with the day's work carefully outlined only to find herself scrapping many of her plans and picking up on a completely different tack. This had to be done discriminately to prevent irrelevancies from insinuating themselves into the program, and to prevent the trainees from taking advantage of a permissive atmosphere.

Much of the classroom curriculum was built upon the experiences of the trainees on the job. Since this differed from group to group and among individuals in the same group, much classroom improvisation had to take place. Moreover, their on-the-job training experience was the first break from the milieu in which they grew up. It required a new way of perceiving situations and the development of skills foreign to them.

We were concerned, too, that if the curriculum was too structured it would become stifling and prohibit trainees from talking freely about their problems. This would also hinder their ability to deal with the problems of the youth with whom they were working and to understand the experimental nature of their tasks. Since much of the trainees' future success depended upon their own ability to innovate rather than to act by rote, the program also had to be innovative to be of encouragement.

The major technique we wanted the trainees to "get" was communication skill tied in with sensitivity. We wanted to sharpen their understanding of how people communicate: to listen with all their senses before reacting; to observe and report accurately without personal feelings interfering; and to evaluate with some measure of sophistication what had taken place.

The major idea we wanted the trainees to "get" was that human behavior is complex and the methods for dealing with it are still in formative stages. To understand the dynamics of a situation or human being provides one not with answers, but with a range of possible alternatives for action.

Within these two major foci, broad, interrelated areas were established. Among these were:

(1) The characteristics of youth from the lower socio-economic classes; problems related to the family, the neighborhood, the peer group, the school, the law; social and anti-social behavior; the sub-cultural attitudes of Negro, Puerto Rican and other minority groups. (The "sub-culture of poverty.")

(2) The economic and sociological factors affecting the job market with particular reference to the problems of youth reaching the age of entry into the labor market.

(3) Perspectives, theory and operation of programs, institutions and agencies now preparing youth for employment.

(4) Techniques for dealing with these youth and their employment problems.

The Training Agency and the Trainees

1. Orientation

During the course of screening and interviewing applicants for the training program, little or no discussion of the National Committee on Employment of Youth as an agency took place. Several people took agency literature as they entered or left the offices; basically, the project was described as a training program under the auspices of MDTA.

On the first day of classes in each of the three groups the Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Employment of Youth welcomed the trainees and spoke briefly about the agency and its role in the field of youth employment. Agency publications were used throughout the training since many dealt directly with relevant topics. It was found that each of the groups, by the end of the training period, felt they knew very little about the agency and asked for more information. Staff attributes this to two circumstances: The site of training was not at the agency offices, so contact with its operation, apart from the training, was non-existent; and the initial orientation was presented to the group at a time when there was no context in which to place it.

A discussion of the agency toward the end of the program was scheduled for the last two groups on the basis of experience with the first group. It was meaningful because the trainees felt a part of the agency and because they knew something about the field in which it operates. Their use of NCEY materials and frequent references made to the agency's studies by consultants and by project staff throughout the training had made NCEY become real to the trainees.

2. Supervision

National Committee on Employment of Youth project staff had responsibility for the classroom and on-the-job supervision of the trainees. While personnel in agencies where they were placed carried out a program of applied training jointly developed with NCEY, we maintained responsibility for the trainee. This was imparted to the group at the outset and the lines of communication were made clear.

Within this context, project staff found its role, outside of the instructive and routine functions, to be basically supportive. Each staff member was called upon by trainees to provide counseling. Where this was appropriate, it was done, where it was not, referrals were made to qualified agencies or professionals.

For many trainees, the program provided their first contact with professionals who cared about them and who were willing and able to see problems through with them. As a consequence, staff was consulted on matters ranging from family break-ups to the methods for applying for a driver's license, from unwed motherhood to skin rashes. Staff learned, through the daily crises, the extent to which the poor are alienated from those services which are available to them and of the inadequate means utilized for publicizing the existence of these services to say nothing of the quality of service obtained once one attempts to obtain it.

3. Agency Services

Trainees were assured of the on-going services of the National Committee on Employment of Youth following comletion of the training project. Virtually all trainees have made use of this assurance. There have been daily telephone calls, visits and letters from trainees, some asking for job referrals, some with personal problems, some seeking information about returning to school or help with a problem on the job, many just to say, hello. Comments from trainees reflect a growing awareness of the value of the training to them and desire to see the program continued for others.

Project staff in visits to agencies where trainees are now working, drop in on trainees and receive the most proud and warm greetings. The feeling of belonging to a group is also very much in evidence; each trainee with whom staff has had contact either passes on information about others with whom he has spoken or asks for information about other trainees. One group wants to know how its placement record compares with the other two. The carry-over of feelings about each other is strong and very positive. This continuity of services and contact is a definite need in any program dealing with people.

Auxiliary Services

Originally staff felt capable of dealing with most problems that might arise in the training group. However, the number and severity of personal problems proved to be overwhelming. Indigenous personnel drawn from areas where poverty is predominant live from crisis to crisis. With no resources to draw upon and lack of knowledge about community services, a single crisis immobilizes them, and training is useless until the crisis is resolved.

To help the project continue its training, we asked for and received the cooperation of Community Service Society, a highly respected case-work agency in New York City. They agreed to provide continuing services and referrals for the trainees. A worker was assigned to the program one afternoon a week to see the trainees on an individual basis. After the worker had made a presentation to the group describing her agency and what her role would be, the trainees accepted her presence and appointments were booked for the first 3 weeks. In fact, the response was so heavy that staff was asked to indicate which trainees should receive priority. Unfortunately the worker assigned took a leave of absence and the Community Service Society was unable to provide an alternate, since it was short-staffed. However, it did offer its regular agency services to us if we would refer trainees directly to it. Many such referrals were made with excellent results.

In addition, NCEY staff was constantly being involved in the personal lives of the trainees. The Project Supervisor went to court a number of times to act as a character witness and to provide moral support. Intervention with the Welfare Department, landlords, and various and sundry credit agencies was a part of the daily activities of staff.

Programs considering the use of indigenous nonprofessionals must be prepared to deal with a myriad of problems rising out of the cumulative effects of isolation, discrimination and deprivation.

Methodology

Several factors influenced the manner in which classroom training was conducted: The diversity of academic backgrounds of the trainees, the lack of a body of written material dealing with the program's content and the decision that the classroom should provide training in interpersonal relationships, as well as in theory and techniques of youth employment work.

The diversity of educational backgrounds of the trainees precluded initiating any academic examination on subject matter learned in prior formal training. No assumptions could be made by staff except that trainees would have experiences to draw upon that would serve well in place of courses taken and textbooks read. Project staff felt it could be demonstrated in a very practical way that the trainee's basic ability - upon which the concept of semi-professional workers was initially based - lies with the disciplined application of his own resources. Consultants were utilized as specialists in presenting academic background material to the trainees, in explaining theory and its application and in exploring ways in which this knowledge could be applied to help young people establish themselves as workers. At all times trainees were cautioned about using their knowledge on levels for which they were not prepared, but they were encouraged to use insight in dealing with others. It was found that trainees were highly responsive to the problem-solving approach to learning, that they could best see subject matter when it was presented within a situational framework with which they could identify and then proceed to explore. Role-play was used to facilitate examination of problems and to provide movement, variety and active involvement in discussion.

One of the primary objectives of the Classroom Supervisor was to encourage trainees to participate in discussions, to become effectively involved in decision-making processes and to be able to draw upon their own experiences in a group setting when learning about group dynamics and interpersonal relationships. Through this learning, we believed would come increased ease and fluency in self-expression, ability to judge and evaluate the ideas of others and, perhaps, the desire to become more effective in relationships with others.

One of the techniques used early in each class was an exercise in problem-solving that remained a touchstone for each of the three groups. A simple aritmetic problem was presented for solution to each member of the group. After solving the problem individually the trainees were grouped according to their answers and each small group was asked to outline the means by which it reached its answer. A representative from each of the small groups was selected to solve, with the other representatives, the problem in front of the class. People were free to change groups if they felt their original answer was incorrect. The entire group was aware that only one answer could be correct. The degree of involvement of the group was extraordinary and discussion following the exercise was spirited in each case.

It was effectively demonstrated that people generally will try to convince each other that they are right rather than work for common solutions. The use of an arithmetic problem in which there was no emotional involvement was highly instructive since the group saw several of its members walk out of the room, threaten fist-fights and become highly agitated in the course of explaining solutions. They could easily infer from this what might take place in dealing with issues in which emotions, personalities, indeed lives, were directly involved. The group's concern with "the answer" rather than the process of solution was also demonstrated since the instructor never told the trainees whose solution was correct. (Trainees from the first group, almost a year later, still jokingly ask for the right answer.)

The problem: A man buys a horse for sixty dollars, sells it for seventy dollars, buys another horse for eighty dollars, and sells it for ninety dollars. How much money did he make?

The Training Group Sessions

Classroom sessions differed somewhat in the first group and the last two groups because of a change in instructors and because, as in all things, we learn from experience.

With the first group, the room used for training was too small to allow for any real movement: Tables and chairs remained in a fixed square pattern imposed by lack of space. The room used by the second and third groups was very large. Chairs with writing arms were used rather than tables, making constant shifting of people and furniture possible. For all three groups there were the same basic pieces of equipment - a blackboard, a bulletin board, a movie projector and a tape recorder. The classroom had no windows, no paintings, in essence, nothing but the trainees and the instructor.

For the first group, classroom sessions were devoted largely to role-playing a variety of job situations, to lectures and discussion sessions with the instructor and consultants and to reports of on-the-job experiences. Since the class was not all in the field on the same days, there was little time after the first two weeks for all of them to share their experiences or to meet with speakers. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, they did see themselves as a group and their evaluation of training revealed more constructive than dissatisfied criticism. The illness of the instructor and his departure before the end of the first training period did not help this group to feel secure as the close of the project neared. Their placement record, however, is evidence that they did gain a great deal from their training.

With the first group, Michael Harrington's The Other America was used as a text and much of the discussion of disadvantaged groups was based upon readings in it. The instructor also felt that note-taking and the setting down of "basics" (e.g., "The Iron Men of Reporting") was important, and there was much reading back of notes in class and concentration on "getting it all down." In the last two groups, Harrington's book was used as a source piece. Notebooks were distributed, but the option to take notes on readings, discussions or lectures was the trainees'.

In the first group, no schedule for the course was distributed to the trainees. For the second and third groups, a flow chart was developed on the first day for the full twelve weeks, indicating days on-the-job, speakers and their topics, field trips, reports, etc. Innumerable changes and additions were made, but trainees knew where they were going and could see a plan of what they were doing. The chart and its content were explained on the second day of classes. There is no question but that the group was relieved to know that someone had thought through what was ahead and could let them know what was in store -- being "in training" and for a new field of work can be a frightening as well as a challenging experience.

Resources

Without the participation of related youth-serving agencies, the NCEY training program could not have had the effectiveness it ultimately achieved. The diversity of approaches, opinions, practical applications, and personalities upon which the curriculum drew gave depth and meaning to the program. Among the areas covered by agency representatives and in field trips were:

(1) Coordination of professional services: A panel of four professionals discussed their individual specialities and how they worked together in serving youth

(2) Structure and purpose of youth-serving agencies, including anti-poverty programs

(3) Youth and the labor market

(4) Education in New York City

(5) Probation and parole

(6) Case studies and their use

(7) Alcohol and narcotic addiction

(8) Working papers

(9) Telephone techniques

(10) Industry hiring patterns in relation to youth

(11) Welfare Services in New York City

(12) Residential treatment centers for youth

Audio-visual aids were used when available. But there appeared to be a dearth of films, tapes, etc., appropriate for our particular group; basically the materials were geared for high-school, clearly middle-class, white audiences. This fact provided the group with another learning experience - the criteria for the production and selection of teaching materials. At all times when audio-visual aids were utilized, the class was asked to examine them not only in terms of academic content but to judge them also as materials available for use in the field.

The trainees were exposed to the mechanics of operating the equipment (tape recorder, movie projector) but were not formally taught its operation. Perhaps such training should have been given since many may be called upon to use these skills.

The use of the tape recorder as a learning device was very helpful. For most trainees it was the first time they had listened to their own voices and speech patterns. The group was anxious for help in correcting what were obvious speech deficiencies. The tape recorder also provided an easy change of pace in classroom activity.

At their first evaluative meeting, OJT supervisors indicated that trainees needed help in the proper use of the telephone for business - how to take messages, identify oneself and the agency, use push-button phones, etc. A representative of the telephone company made a presentation to the last two groups on telephone techniques.

Trainees were asked to clip relevant articles from magazines, newspapers, etc., for their own use and to be shared with each other. A bulletin board was set up in the classroom for this purpose and each trainee was given a filing envelope in which to keep his material. Observation indicated that virtually all trainees read daily newspapers, and that many read more than one. Interest in current issues, particularly activity in the anti-poverty programs, was very high and much discussion centered around emerging programs and activity within the city. Exposure to agencies and program officials heightened this interest and made for a sense of direct involvement.

All trainees were asked to pick up materials available at and used by their agencies, so that NCEY could compile folders on each program for use by all trainees. Many found valuable items (teaching materials, interview schedules, testing devices, etc.), which they got in quantity or had duplicated and which they distributed to the entire group. This provided an opportunity for individual trainees to assume a leadership role in the classroom by explaining the materials and their use and by responding to questions from the class at large. In addition, a sense of responsibility for the group was developed in each member and their ability to share increased.

Consultants were asked to provide written materials for the group and whenever possible they did so. Many also gave the trainees bibliographies prepared beforehand or sent in later in response to trainees' requests. Still there is no question but that the group felt the need for more written resource materials. In one evaluation session, trainees said that NCEY should compile a textbook that could be used for their training and as a reference and source book. NCEY staff agrees that there is a need for a text and that it should be developed with a view toward its general applications in the training field. Such a text should not, however, eliminate the use of outside source people and the experiences and knowledge of trainees in the discussion and presentation of curriculum areas.

Training Content

Outlines for two major parts of the classroom curriculum were prepared by educational consultants, based upon suggestions from the Advisory Committee and the Project Supervisor. These outlines had as their themes "Social & Psychological Problems of Disadvantaged Youth Affecting Their Employment" and "Communication Skills." While these topics served as the focus for all three training groups, the order of the material presented and the emphasis placed upon segments of the original plan were altered to suit the perceived needs of the students. Records of the curriculum as presented were not kept by the first student supervisor; the training schedules for Groups II and III are listed in Appendix B.

Reporting Techniques

An examination of the variety of forms in which reporting is accomplished (written and oral) and of the techniques and skills required for performance was undertaken. A newspaper reporter delineated basic observation skills, requirements for effective reporting and the difference between reporting and evaluation. In class, written reports were required, oral reports of on-the-job training experiences were made and skill sessions were held on written and spoken English. The use of jargon was discussed.

The first written material required was an observation report on a field trip to Mobilization For Youth. Emphasis was placed on observing the neighborhood in which MFY is located and on the group's personal reactions to what they saw. It was clear upon receipt of the reports that the trainees had little or no experience in setting down their feelings. Almost all trainees wrote tedious step by step accounts of the tour they took, too often including reactions such as "it was very informative" or "I enjoyed it very much." The instructor felt that this was an instance in which the disadvantaged nature of the trainee population was very apparent; having lived in a society that neither asks for nor values their opinions, they simply did not have sufficient practice in making their judgments known. Group discussion of their reactions to the trip brought forth a wealth of feelings, but only after trainees were sure enough that their feelings could indeed be shared and be of importance.

The third group benefited most from this experience as they were asked to write their impressions several weeks later in the program, when such an assignment could be understood and effectively carried out. The successful completion of the assignment by almost all members of this group bore out the wisdom of the instructor's planned delay.

Other written observation reports were undertaken successfully by the trainees. In addition, the groups were asked to write their own resumes to be duplicated by NCEY. Instruction was given in their preparation and use and, following their writing, the trainees wrote sample covering letters, one an application for a specific job and one asking to be considered should job openings occur. The groups shared their letters so that they might benefit from what others had done. In Group III, the trainees spontaneously applauded one letter as being excellent. Interestingly, however, they felt comfortable enough with what they had produced individually not to ask to use the letter as a general model. This self-confidence was in marked contrast to the constant need for answers, rules and solutions evidenced at the outset of training.

The third training group was asked to prepare written case studies of one of their on-the-job training clients, following models presented to them by an outside speaker. The group discussed in advance those items necessary in a case study and its purpose. Separation of the reporting of fact and data from impressions was a valuable, if difficult lesson.

At four stages in the training, the groups were asked for written reports on their on-the-job training stations. The first report covered their first day on the job and was to be descriptive of the agency and of their impressions of it. In the third week on the job, trainees were asked to write detailed descriptions of their jobs. These were written again after seven weeks. During the final week of training, each trainee wrote an evaluation of his on-the-job training station, answering the following questions:

> Name of agency   Name of supervisor
>
> Was the agency placement suitable to you? How? Why?
>
> What did you learn from the placement?
>
> How did you respond to the supervision you received?
>
> Should changes be made in the placement before another trainee is sent there?
>
> Would you want to work permanently for the agency? Why?

Oral reporting was a daily procedure in the classroom. Feedback from individual on-the-job training stations was a primary focus and provided much of the basis for group discussions. Evaluation of speakers was most helpful in providing the group with the opportunity to see others' perceptions of a shared experience and in sharpening the trainees' ability to put their reactions into words clearly.

The ability of trainees to express themselves in writing improved dramatically during the course of training. The trainees whose initial reports were composed of a few platitudes, ended training by submitting careful analyses of their job stations, and realistic critiques of their supervision.

Psychological Background Material

Factors affecting the development and growth of young people were discussed in depth, as were the ways in which these factors affect the employability of youth. In large measure the trainees were asked to draw upon their own observations and experiences in establishing a general picture of disadvantaged youth.

Staff focused attention on those broad topics considered by them to constitute the social parameters of the problem of youth and the labor market: behavior (social and anti-social); the family; the home; the peer group; the school; and the neighborhood.

In the discussions of behavior, the trainees dealt with motivation and with the roles they would play in motivating young people. They established what they felt were the limits of "normal" behavior and, by refinement of their definition, approached the particular problems of young people who belong in several parts of "society" as a whole, but who reject and are rejected by portions of it. The trainees also tried to draw up differences between disadvantaged youth and middle-class youth and to see what effects these differences would have on their employability.

Information on narcotic addiction, alcoholism, and delinquency were presented by expert consultants who dealt with causes, remedies and effects and with what remains to be done in their fields.

The home and family were considered by trainees from a variety of vantage points. They discussed the differences between male and female-dominated homes; the problems of the home with only one parent; the working mother; the unemployed father; living conditions as they effect health, growth and behavior; role-models; illegitimacy and birth control; sibling rivalry.

The peer group and its effect on behavior and development were discussed. The differences between what the family and the peer group provides for youth were examined, and those areas in which friends serve as role-models were explored.

The school and its relationship to young people from minority or disadvantaged groups was discussed, as were the roles of family, home and peer group in the learning process. The problem of English as a second language and the way in which the school handles it was discussed. The trainees probed for the reasons why young people drop out of school and attempted to see their roles in identifying and dealing with dropouts or potential dropouts. The relationship of the vocational school curriculum to the job market was explored.

The neighborhood, containing the home, family, peer group and school was discussed as a marked influence on young people. The growth of slum and ghetto living in urban centers was also examined.

Case studies were developed for use by the group as a means of illustrating the interrelatedness of all of the above factors. Knowledge and experiences gained in the training program were integrated through the use of these case studies, and trainees drew upon their newly acquired skills to discuss and evaluate how particular problems might be handled. Near the end of the course, the trainees themselves wrote case studies, prior to which they set up an outline of the material necessary for inclusion in such an analysis.

The examination of social and psychological factors influencing young people was extremely valuable to the trainees, as it enabled them to gain insights and sensitivity about their clients and about themselves as well. Without being "analytical," the trainees were able to look beyond what young people told them and to come up with a range of causes for exhibited behavior on the basis of the client's home, family and school background.

Youth and The Labor Market

Professionals from a variety of youth employment agencies, industry and youth-serving programs presented a picture of today's labor market, youth's place and problems within it and efforts being made to help youth in their need for jobs. Very specific information and resources were integrated with the sociological factors affecting youth employment to enable trainees to deal with practical problems on the job. The New York State Employment Service, The New York City Youth Board and the Board of Education provided quantities of literature and forms for the trainees on topics ranging from wage-and-hour laws to locations of offices where applications for working papers can be filed. The direct services of agencies were outlined along with the philosophy under which the agencies operate.

Discussions between agency professionals and the trainees during and following presentations often brought to light the need for exploration of ways to increase services and utilize semi-professional personnel. The exchanges were extremely valuable for both sides, enabling each to see the other's perception of the same field, its weaknesses, strengths and potentials. Trainees were, as might be anticipated, concerned about job prospects and asked most speakers about openings in their agencies. The way in which these questions were handled were often indications of movement within professional circles about the question of hiring semi-professionals. Whether or not the possibility of hiring semi-professionals within their agencies existed, the speakers were all highly enthusiastic about the training and were able to learn something from the trainees.

Remediation Techniques

Three remediation specialists were used as consultants during each of the three sections. Two were only partially successful with the trainees, but a third was extremely helpful and was rated by each group as outstanding. The first consultant described at length the remedial program he directed. Trainee interest centered around the rationale for the conduct of various phases of the program which were innovative (e.g., instruction at the worksite rather than in a classroom). The consultant also presented a display of books and pamphlets available for use in remedial programs and discussed the effectiveness of each. Since this was the group's introduction to remediation, the presentation did little to answer their basic questions or to provide techniques they could use immediately and without benefit of teaching materials.

The most resourceful consultant provided the group with the missing elements, and more. Beginning by involving the trainees in a discussion of why people read and learn, he evolved with them a theory of the need for remediation and an introduction to learning theory. He then provided techniques, based on what they had developed, for teaching reading and language skills, given a youth and an empty room. He quickly explained, by imaginative illustration, such concepts as word grouping, phonics, word recognition, sound blends, etc. In later sessions trainees brought him examples of the way they used these techniques and improvised with them. He was receptive to discussion of trainees' problems with clients. He also gave the group a bibliography about teaching reading. His success with the group can be attributed to a number of factors. He always provided a theoretical framework or reason for methodology; he provided specific approaches that the trainees could use with ease; and he involved the trainees in discussion.

The third consultant, although doing all the above, was not as successful with the group. Discussion by the trainees revealed they felt they were being spoken to as if they were "in elementary school." This was an excellent example of the way in which attitudes affect learning. Trainees who worked as remedial aides shared their experiences with the total group, and, in self-help sessions with each other, discussed problems and techniques they had come across.

In the second group, Spanish classes were held informally, while in the third group they were a regular part of the classwork, conducted by Spanish-speaking trainees. Responses to learning a second language and involvement of the group were outstanding. Trainees could begin to see the problems their clients faced with learning English and could see, as well, some of the teaching techniques they had learned being put into practice. They were also motivated by a desire to communicate, though minimally, with the Spanish-speaking young people they encountered.

Project staff, in evaluating the teaching of remediation, feels that it had two major lacks: it was not sufficiently consistent and it provided no work in mathematical skills.

Interviewing Techniques

The techniques of interviewing were taught in a variety of ways. Instructors began with a discussion of the uses of interviewing, drawing upon trainee experiences to illustrate its scope (job interview, credit interview, medical history, etc.). We often utilized role-play situations, either pairing all members of the group to conduct simultaneous interviews from prepared schedules or holding demonstration interviews before the entire group. This practice was continued throughout the training period. The tape recorder was used occasionally to add to the learning.

Written materials were provided by one speaker in which two techniques of interviewing were discussed: the directive and non-directive approaches.

The Classroom Supervisor utilized the trainees' on-the-job training experiences in interviewing by conducting small group sessions in which trainees shared techniques, problems and experiences and discussed them among themselves.

These "self-help" sessions proved valuable in that they provided a further opportunity to share experiences, to spread the role of teacher, and to participate in a problem-solving situation.

The Role of the Professional in Youth Employment Programs

Each speaker devoted time either in his presentation or during the question period to the role and methodology of his particular discipline. In this way, the various professions which make up the field were explored, and, at the same time, the trainees were afforded a view of agency structure. Through active discussion both with the professionals and as a group, the trainees began to evolve a definition of their own potential roles in agency hierarchy and to pinpoint those areas of sensitivity in agency structure which the professionals, unwittingly or not, revealed to them.

Group III asked for a special session in which the educational,experiential and role differences among professionals could be defined (e.g. case worker, group worker, lay analyst, psychiatrist, psychologist, counselor). This session not only fulfilled its stated purpose but led those trainees interested in the possibility of pursuing professional careers in the field to come to some conclusions about their specific interests and capacities.

Evaluation

The trainee's ability to evaluate situations and materials was deemed important to their progress in the field and practical application of evaluative techniques took place throughout the program. Whether trainees were discussing a speaker's presentation, the way in which a situation on the job was handled, or a particular program they had visited, they became aware of their growing skill in establishing criteria for performance and in articulating their judgments. The roles of objectivity and subjectivity in the evaluation process were discussed and trainees were encouraged to demonstrate the steps by which their conclusions were reached. In addition, each group of trainees spent close to a full week at the end of the program in self-and training program-evaluation sessions. (The evaluation of the on-the-job training experience is discussed under Reporting.)

For the final evaluation sessions trainees were divided into three small groups. Within each group, consensus was achieved for reporting back to the full group and dissenting opinions noted on the following topics:

(1) Classroom sessions (information and discussion)

(2) Skill sessions

(3) Teaching materials and techniques

(4) Field trips

(5) Outside speakers

(6) Physical facilities

(7) On-the-job training preparation

(8) Composition of training group

(9) Staff

Staff did not participate in the several hours of discussions. Each group designated one person to keep the discussion moving and one person to take notes and report back to the total group. Following the reports of the small groups, comments and discussion took place.

The quality of insightful evaluation in each of the three sections was extremely high. Trainees were able to be critical without being insensitive and to see their own weaknesses and strengths as being in direct relationship to those of the program itself. Many of the comments and suggestions made by trainees during the course of training and in these evaluative meetings were utilized by staff in their planning.

In the second and third groups, trainees were given a full day's written assignment, consisting of a group of questions designed to pull together much of the material discussed throughout the training. For staff, the assignment served as an indicator of trainees' ability to express themselves tersely in writing. For trainees, the assignment was more a test of recall and of their ability to put both practical and theoretical material and experience into concise and intelligible form. It served well on both levels.

Training Evaluation

A final evaluation conference was held with each trainee based upon a prior discussion by all staff. Individual staff members discussed these evaluation reports with the individual trainees. The staff members selected the trainees for conference at random except where it was felt that a particular staff member should or should not see a given trainee. No time limit was set for these conferences to insure each trainee an opportunity to discuss freely and privately the content of the evaluation. The final evaluation concerned itself primarily with two areas: performance and potential. Project staff's assessment of the way the trainee functioned in his on-the-job training, as a student in the classroom, as a member of the training group, and in his relationships to staff was presented. The trainee's potential was discussed with him in its negative and positive aspects and, where staff felt the services of other agencies or institutions could be useful, the offer of referral was made.

In each conference two points were stressed: that what was being said reflected the thinking of the total staff, and that the services of the National Committee on Employment of Youth and the project staff would be available for an indefinite period following completion of the course. The latter was discussed with the group a number of times, but it was felt important to emphasize again in the quiet of a conference setting in hopes of allaying some of the feelings of insecurity and of being stranded that the majority of trainees were evidencing.

Attitudes Toward Didactic Training

The attitudes of trainees toward the didactic training were reflected both in subtle and concrete ways. Their evaluation of the course indicated sensitive and thought-out reactions to their experience and included recommendations for change that showed real concern and were practical and candid. Their daily attitudes in the classroom reflected, as might be expected, the highs and lows of the program, their experiences on the job and their immediate feelings about themselves.

The two taken together gave a broad picture of how the trainees reacted to the didactic training. It must be emphasized that one cannot examine the attitudes of the groups toward the training they received without bearing in mind throughout, the expectations with which they entered training, the attitudes toward learning upon which those expectations were based, and the way in which the training itself attempted either to fulfill or obviate the groups' expectations.

Each group entered training with the same nebulous notion of what it would be - a course in which they would learn to work with youth and for which they would be paid. Although the program was described in the initial interview, trainees were naturally more concerned about making an impression at that time than in finding out about the program. Some thought they would, at the end of training, be social workers, teachers, interviewers or counselors. Others had been interested by the idea of working with people. The notion of doing something that seemed useful and receiving a stipend was, most probably, the inducement for the majority.

The previous experiences of the trainees with the educational system became apparent very quickly. They were accustomed to being told, to getting answers and rules. In this regard the instructor for the first group was ideally suited to the trainees since he was inclined to offer the kinds of solutions and lists which their experience demanded. The instructor for the last two groups, however, differed in approach and made disturbingly clear from the outset that there would and could not be any "answers" for questions of human behavior and that the methods for dealing with young people would have to vary from client to client and with the personality and style of the worker. As has been previously noted, it was the instructor's intent to involve the trainees in problem-solving, a process which required them to teach as well as learn. The approach to curriculum, therefore, was within this context, as well as being consistent with the course content.

The first group's exposure to the need for finding their own solutions on the job resulted in their ultimate rejection of "answers" in the classroom. They began to insist on breaking the pattern of being told. Though this change manifested itself in hostility, it was nonetheless growth of the most positive kind.

In the second and third groups, there was an objective understanding and an acceptance of the need for trainees to work through their problems rather than to have them solved for them. Staff's ability to break the pattern of dependence on "experts" and rules, however, presented a disturbing challenge and evoked considerable resistance. This, however, was anticipated and the practical experiences on the job bore out the validity of the approach to the point where trainees were to a great degree able to adopt the new and more difficult method of dealing with situations on their own.

Trainees responded very well to speakers' presentations. They were always given the opportunity to question a speaker at any point during his talk and to have discussions with him following it. For the most part, trainees were perceptive in their responses to speakers and candid with them. They asked pointed questions, reflecting not only their concerns about the field, but also their role in it. When trainees felt a speaker was not sincere, they probed enough to be sure. The professional grapevine began to spread the word that speakers would have to be on their toes with this group. Staff was extremely pleased with this and speakers felt a new and positive challenge.

The need for movement and diversity in the classroom was great. If not met, the group reacted with hostility, open evidence of boredom and inattention. While this was understandable to staff, it was felt that part of the group's learning would have to include a raising of their level of tolerance for situations that did not conform to their wishes,as well as the ability to improve existing situations when use of initiative could make change possible. In addition, since many trainees indicated a desire to go back to school, it was important that they learned to adjust their attention spans to the demands of a classroom situation.

Role playing to demonstrate techniques and situations was used with all three groups. In the first group this teaching method was used extensively, and, according to the trainees, to excess. Staff utilized this information in planning for the other groups and introduced role playing very selectively; it proved to be a highly successful technique when used sparingly. It is recommended that role playing be used as a teaching technique because it affords activity, involvement, change of pace and the opportunity to play-act,all of which is appealing. Too, the instructor, if he is wise, can enter into the drama and assume one of the roles, thereby allowing all participants the chance to place themselves in another's shoes. Many inhibitions are broken down and insights can be gained as both instructor and trainee view each other's perceptions of familiar situations.

Perhaps the most important by-product of the evaluation experience for the trainees is that they have learned on their own to question, to discuss, and to challenge those people, precepts and institutions formerly seen as forces beyond their control, or worse, in control of them. They have become more independent and free as a consequence and have found meaningful ways to be involved in the processes that influence their lives.

PART III - FIELD TRAINING

Field Trips

Observations of agencies and programs was included in the program and designed to provide direct contact with a variety of youth-serving agencies. In addition, tours of particular neighborhoods were also arranged. Trainees were required to submit individual written and oral descriptive reports. Class discussion took place following the presentation of these reports in an effort to evaluate the services offered to youth.

As time went on, staff planned fewer and fewer field trips. We found that many trips turned into lectures held in a closed room. Little opportunity was given, in these cases, to see or talk with the youth with whom the particular agencies dealt. Even where tours of total facilites were arranged, too often all one saw were rows of desks and telephones. The trainees themselves were the severest critics of poorly structured trips - they often felt that it was a waste of their time to travel to an agency and sit in a closed room to be talked at by a worker for that agency.

Those field trips which were continued by the program involved direct contact with the youth as well as with the administration.

On-The-Job Training

Experience has shown that learning takes place only when there is active participation by the learner. The on-the-job training element was designed to provide a practical application of the subject matter covered in the classroom. It was the means by which the trainee applied information learned about youth and youth employment in a job situation. Since trainees were entering a new field, it was our contention that they needed actual involvement in work situations with youth before seeking permanent placement. It was a time for trying out their newly gained skills in a protected setting; mistakes made would not lead to dismissal. To enhance this, we acted in a supportive role to the trainees as they worked through their relationships with agencies, professionals and work.

In order to ensure that the experiences in the classroom and on the job had meaning and purpose for the trainees, we provided agency supervisors with the curriculum used in the classroom so that they could build their training around it.

Despite antipathy toward the use of nonprofessionals by some agencies, we had little difficulty obtaining job stations for the trainees; many more agencies wanted to participate in the program than we had anticipated, and a wide range of public and private agencies took part in offering on-the-job training. (See Appendix C for a listing of these agencies.) The kinds of jobs performed, however, did not differ as much as one would expect; there were remarkable similarities among agencies with different goals, clientele and sponsorship.

Our major concern in placing trainees in agencies was that there be a real learning experience. We wanted to avoid situations of a make-work nature. As much as possible, we wanted the trainees to have direct contact with the youth being served. When some agencies did not adhere to these requirements, we moved the trainees out and placed them in other settings. In a few instances we moved trainees out of agencies simply because the placement was a mismatch between the trainee's skills and attitudes and the agency's perception of the job to be done, and not because of inadequate learning or of exploitation taking place.

In the first training section, six of the twenty-one trainees had their stations changed. In all but one case the trainees had too little to do and had only limited contacts with youth. In the second group, five trainees out of twenty were moved to new stations, two because of not enough to do, the other three because of difficulties in personal adjustment to the work or the supervisor. Only one trainee changed agencies in the third group and this was because of inadequate supervision. Several changes were made within agencies due to program reorganization, but here the agencies took responsibility for changes and provided the necessary reorientation to new supervisors and new tasks.

Agencies more often underutilized the trainees than misused them. Trainees were sometimes left to shift for themselves without direction or assignment. This was usually done when the work assignments were not carefully delineated or when the supervisors were themselves unsure about how to use nonprofessionals.

One of the more serious problems related to job stations was knowing how much information on each trainee should be given to agency supervisors. For example, we had enrolled a young man with a background of narcotic addiction. His referral agency assured us he had given up the habit. When time came for his training placement we discussed what information on his background and experience should be given to the agency. When the question arose of his past use of narcotics, we left the decision of what to tell his supervisor up to him. He felt that he wasn't prepared to tell anyone about it at that time. After the first two weeks on the job, while discussing a youth's addiction in a staff conference at his station, he blurted out his own experience with drugs. We received an irate call from his supervisor who wanted to know why we hadn't told him about this part of the trainee's background. We explained that we had left it to the trainee's own discretion, and also explained our own underlying fear that the agency might have not taken an ex-addict on staff. The supervisor assured us that the knowledge would only have affected the way in which training was given and nothing else. From that point on we provided participating agencies with all relevant data about the trainees placed with them. This was done with the knowledge and agreement of the trainees. Information provided included name, address, age, sex, past work experience, legal involvement, and any other factors that might be useful to the supervisors.

One of the major criticisms against using nonprofessionals had to do with their access to confidential files and records. There was a fear that this information, in the hands of nonprofessionals, could be damaging to the clients. However, the trainees seemed to have a deeper sense of responsibility toward confidential material than some professionals. Part of this came from their ability to empathize with the youth, having gone through misuse of their own records at various points in their lives. When presenting actual cases handled by their agencies to the other trainees in the class, they were careful to eliminate or disguise identifying material so that no breach of confidence took place. This skill was practiced by the trainees without too much emphasis by NCEY staff.

Despite each trainee having had at least two years of cumulative work experience, many of them needed some help with elementary work habits. Matters related to proper conduct in a job interview, the need for promptness, and the ability to describe accurately their backgrounds had to be discussed in some detail. Much of this material made a deep impression after they had to talk with youth on the job about the need for good work habits. The practical experience of seeing and relating to others with similar faults reinforced the classroom instruction. As one trainee said, "How can I tell kids what to do when I don't do it myself?" Personal habits, such as cleanliness and proper dress, were never a problem in the program. In fact, the tendency on the part of some trainees was to be a bit overdressed.

One of the most valuable aspects of the training was the utilization of agency supervisors in the classroom to describe their goals, the type of youth they worked with and the jobs the trainees were doing and could do in the future. Their practical approach enabled the trainees to ask specific questions on techniques and methodology. The supervisors, in turn, saw the trainees as a group and could then tailor the work in their agencies to provide what they believed the trainees needed. Moreover, the involvement in the classroom work made the on-the-job relationship between supervisor and trainee much closer.

Comments made by on-the-job supervisors both in regular written reports and in conversations with NCEY staff indicated that the trainees were performing at an extremely high level of skill for which the supervisors were unprepared. Many dramatic incidents furthered this thinking.

In one instance a trainee had been placed as a remedial aide in a counseling agency. A young man was referred to her with the comment from professional staff that he needed help with math; it seemed he just couldn't grasp the basic theories. Working closely with the youth for a number of sessions, the trainee found the problem was that he couldn't read the examples! His math level was extremely high; he was doing complicated arithmetic problems in his head. The discovery by the nonprofessional that the professional had diagnosed the youth's problem wrongly probably saved that particular youth many heartaches.

There are other dramatic cases we could cite to illustrate the ability of the trainees to work with youth in need of help, but their major contributions have been in the day-to-day performance of routine tasks which relieved the professionals of much burdensome work and enabled them to spread their skills where needed most. As these factors became more evident, trainees were allowed to perform additional tasks that gradually brought most to a full semi-professional level. The supervisors felt more confident about the trainees' ability to perform a variety of nonprofessional tasks. This changing concept of the role of nonprofessionals was dramatic. The on-the-job training segment proved its worth as it gave supervisors an opportunity to try out nonprofessionals without having to guarantee full-time jobs or to risk agency policies.

The need for constant follow-up of trainees on the job by the NCEY Field Supervisor was apparent early in the program. Unfortunately, because of a staff change and an overlapping of NCEY staff assignments, follow-up was not always as intensive as it should have been. As the program progressed and as staff became more sure of the direction the program was taking, follow-up activities were increased and improved.

The most successful job stations from our point of view were in those agencies that provided a variety of activities and opportunities for trainees to test themselves in different roles. The least successful, again from our point of view, were in those agencies with unstructured programs or where the trainees had to wait for youth to appear before doing any work. These latter programs might achieve great success with the hard-core youth they serve, but our trainees looked upon them as being poorly planned; they wanted more structure.

Insecurities arose among some trainees placed in agencies where budgets were due to be cut or changed in some way. This reflected the feelings of apprehension on the part of professionals in those agencies. The trainees raised questions about their training for work in a field so unstable and where jobs for nonprofessionals were nonexistent.

Job Development and Placement

During the initial screening interview each applicant was asked to read aloud the following statement:

> "It is hoped that those who finish the training will be placed on regular full-time jobs. However, we cannot guarantee that everyone who completes the training will be employed. Repeat: We cannot guarantee you a job."

The reasons for this were explained to them: (1) the program was experimental in nature, openings did not exist and the jobs had to be developed; (2) it is illegal to guarantee a person a job; (3) since NCEY would not be doing the hiring, each trainee would have to be interviewed and accepted or rejected by the agencies to which he would apply or be referred; and (4) we might find, or the trainee himself might find, that working with youth was not appropriate for him.

This theme was mentioned continuously throughout each of the training sections. The necessity for repitition became evident with one disappointing event. A large youth-serving agency promised to provide jobs to twenty trainees, ten for the first section and five each for the other two sections. When graduation time came for the first section, the promised jobs were not there; staff and trainees were extremely disappointed and disillusioned. This kind of situation reinforced our decision to be as honest as possible about job possibilities, even to the extent of being negative about them.

Toward the end of all three training sections, trainees began showing concern over the possibilities of final placement. Staff had to deal constantly with questions related to jobs. Since we were not sure ourselves what would be available, we had to approach the problem from a number of directions. Most agencies were not prepared to commit themselves on hiring our trainees at specified times; however, many held out hope for future placement when and if their budgets were approved or increased. The delay in funding many of the anti-poverty programs had a great deal to do with delays in hiring staff. A few agencies made tentative commitments, which, we were told, could be withdrawn or expanded depending upon the funds made available.

To aid trainees in their search for full-time employment, we developed with them resumes of their background and experiences. These were put on stencils and we made fifty copies. Twenty copies were given to each trainee and thirty copies were retained by NCEY. We encouraged the trainees to send their resumes to as many youth-serving agencies as possible. In turn, we sent out their resumes to selected agencies. Response to the resumes by agency personnel has been excellent even where no placement occurred.

All trainees were registered by counselors of the Professional Office of the New York State Employment Service. These counselors were very cooperative and have devoted a great deal of time to contacting potential employers, arranging interviews and making referrals.

Personal visits and telephone calls by NCEY staff to potential employers have been an ongoing function. Trainees were also instructed to canvass agencies in their neighborhoods in person and by mail, to leave their resumes and to request formal interviews. Wherever possible, trainees obtained letters of recommendation from their on-the-job training supervisors.

The point we had to emphasize over and over again to the trainees was that it was our belief that jobs would be available to them, but that it was a matter of "when" these openings would occur. We tried to prepare them for a possible long-term search to ensure that they would not give up hope. To this end, much classroom time was devoted to the problem of how people get jobs; what methods they might use, what resources they could draw on, and what kind of presentation should be made. We stressed the fact that NCEY would be there to help them in any way possible with either job-related or personal problems.

Placements bear out our premise that it was a matter of perseverance that in time, openings would occur.

Of the twenty people who completed training in the first group, fourteen are working full-time in jobs related to the training, two are working full-time in jobs not related to training, one is working part-time, one has returned to school on a full-time basis, one is unemployed, and one has lost contact with the program.

Of the twenty people who completed training in the second group, fourteen are working full-time in jobs related to training, one is working full-time in a job not related to training, one is deceased, but was working full-time in a related job at the time of his death, three are unemployed, and one has lost contact with the program.

Of the nineteen people who completed training in the third group, eight are working full-time in jobs related to training, two are working full-time in jobs not related to training, two are working part-time, and seven are unemployed.

Most of the unemployed are in the last group to be graduated and less time has been available for their placement. We have received indications that five of the seven unemployed in the third group will soon be working full-time in the field. The one person unemployed in the first group turned down a full-time job when she graduated in order to take part in the civil-rights movement in the South. We have hopes that she, too, will soon be employed. Two of the three unemployed in the second group and two of the seven unemployed in the third group, are people we enrolled with the knowledge that it might be difficult to place them. This was discussed earlier in the report as possibly being attributed to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The thirty-six people working full-time in related jobs are earning annual salaries ranging from $3,200 to $7,500 with the average salary just under $5,000 per year. These people were all unemployed at the time of training; the average salary level of their last jobs was $3,200 per year.

In addition to the one trainee attending school full-time, ten trainees are attending school part-time and another eight are considering starting school next term.

The following chart indicates the relationship between on-the-job training stations and final placement. For many trainees, their on-the-job training agency proved to be the entree into full-time employment with that agency. For more people, however, placement was obtained in agencies where on-the-job training did not take place. (For a list of agencies providing full-time jobs see Appendix C.)

Trainees Employed In Full-Time Jobs Related To Training*

	Section 1 N=14	Section 2 N=14	Section 3 N=8	Total of Sections N=36
Number employed in same agencies where on-the-job training took place.	6	4	4	14
Number employed in agencies where on-the-job training did not take place.	8	10	4	22

*Does not include trainees going to school, working part-time, working outside the field, deceased, unemployed, or dropped from program.

Job Descriptions

Prior to approval of the contract, NCEY canvassed many agencies in New York City and conducted a search through pertinent literature in the field to discover the types of jobs being filled by nonprofessionals or the types of jobs contemplated for them. Thus, a preliminary list was drawn up with brief descriptions of the duties to be performed.

In our initial contacts with those agencies planning to participate in the on-the-job training phase of the program, we asked them to enumerate the tasks to which the trainees would be assigned. Very little concrete information was received at this point; agencies wanted to see what the trainees were like before assigning specific tasks. The agencies felt they knew too little about the use of nonprofessional personnel and needed time to prepare their staffs.

What little information we obtained from them was couched in very broad, nebulous terms. We discussed with them the tentative list of jobs we had drawn up; some they accepted readily as possibilities and some they did not. Each agency had its own strong concept of what nonprofessionals should not do; they were less sure about what nonprofessionals could do. For example, a number of agencies were strongly opposed to the idea of using our trainees as Job Developers since this job was felt to require special characteristics and experience generically different from the other jobs suggested.

Once the first section of trainees was assigned to job stations, we were ready to proceed with the next phase in the development of job descriptions. Trainees reported regularly, orally and in writing about the specific tasks they were performing. Each trainee was asked to describe his day in detail, including every specific function with which he was involved. The following questions were asked:

(1) Describe your job station, the agency and the clientele.

(2) What were your major tasks?

(3) What were your minor tasks?

(4) What special equipment or material did you use?

(5) What was your relationship with youth - direct or indirect?

(6) What kind of orientation, training and supervision did you get?

(7) What special skills did you use?

(8) What do you need to know to perform your job well?

Numerous other questions of a probing nature had to be asked since trainees, particularly during the first few weeks, tended to gloss over many aspects of their jobs or to express themselves in general rather than specific terms. For example, after a trainee had reported that her major tasks related to reception and intake, she was asked what else she had done (minor tasks) and replied, "Oh, nothing much, I just sat there and talked to people." We asked her to describe what she did hour by hour. It soon became obvious that she had performed many important functions without being aware of it. She referred ineligible applicants to other agencies, she received and passed on messages for the professional staff, she guided applicants to the proper office, she kept records of all her contacts, etc. It was the first time the trainees had ever analyzed their own or other people's jobs and it proved to be an important learning experience.

These reports provided us with enough raw data to develop a first draft of their job descriptions. During the course of the program the trainees were asked to report again and again on their jobs noting particularly any duties which had been added or deleted from their tasks. This gave us an opportunity to see their progress on the job. It also gave the trainees practice in developing observation, reporting and evaluation techniques. This procedure was followed with all three training sections.

In addition to this kind of information, we obtained verbal and written reports from the trainees' supervisors in their agencies. The written segment was included in a biweekly trainee evaluation form we asked supervisors to fill out. Our Field Supervisor also contributed importantly to this material by observing the trainees in the performance of their jobs at regular intervals and reporting on their activities.

With the cooperation of the New York City Professional Office of the New York State Employment Service we obtained in the official Dictionary of Occupational Titles, a non-professional job title and number: Professional Aide, 0-27.52. We then drew up a broad job description which included most of the activities which the trainees, as a group performed. We then grouped the functions under five sub-groups with the titles of: Field Representative; Placement Aide, Work Crew Leader (or Assistant Work Crew Leader); Case Aide; and Teacher Aide.

These can be further subdivided if one chooses. For example, we included under Field Representative those tasks which characterize Outreach Workers, Neighborhood Aides and Follow-up Aides. None of the jobs delineated are discrete; most trainees now employed are performing a variety of tasks which include duties subsumed under more than one sub-group. However, we felt this could be helpful to programs about to utilize nonprofessionals for the first time. Each agency or program would have to adapt and re-order the tasks to suit their own needs and clientele.

Moreover, while these descriptions might be suitable for many fields, we confined them as much as possible to youth employment activities and related functions. The descriptions are included in Appendix E.

Conclusion

The nonprofessional worker needs a highly structured situation - at least when first hired - in which he can perform effectively. While he can be extremely resourceful within his given areas of functioning, his previous experience, largely in unskilled occupations, limits his ability to work successfully without direction. Supervision of nonprofessionals, therefore, must be different from the kind provided to professionals. Few, if any, nonprofessionals will have had "white collar" jobs, and they tend to associate the role of a supervisor with that of a foreman in a production situation. Instead of the give-and-take of a supervisory conference, they expect to be told how and what to do. The sophistication, discipline and self-confidence required to work in an unstructured atmosphere will have to be learned.

The nonprofessional should have one person to whom he can turn for direction and guidance and a base to which he can return for support and instruction. This does not preclude his working with a number of professionals, but it does imply that one person should be responsible for the way in which his work is assigned and carried out and for the way in which other professionals deal with him. Like all workers, the nonprofessional needs meaningful and varied tasks to perform within a well-defined role. He needs the opportunity to expand his knowledge, increase his skills and, consequently, assume greater responsibility. His place in regular agency or program operations should be clear to him and to other personnel lest he be given unrelated and meaningless jobs simply because he is there.

Nonprofessionals should be encouraged to discuss methods and techniques for dealing with their own jobs within agencies as well as with the target populations. Through an adequate understanding of their own roles, they can function better with those in need of their services. The workers also should know that they will be held responsible to the supervisors and agencies for what they do. The role of the supervisor is difficult, then, because he must allow the nonprofessionals to achieve a degree of independence within these limits of responsibility.

The regularity of supervisory conferences depends upon each individual agency, but for nonprofessionals these conferences should be held no less frequently than conferences with other staff. Whether the nonprofessionals act independently or as a member of a team, the supervisor must establish the kind of relationship with them that will result in achieving the goals of the program. Experiments in the use of nonprofessionals seem to indicate that supervisory time must be extensive in the beginning, but, as the workers become more familiar with their roles, this time can be reduced somewhat. Where a thoughtful supervisory program has been established, the nonprofessionals have been freer to admit their inability to cope with various problems and to seek the necessary help than in those instances where supervision is provided on a haphazard basis.

One of the more difficult tasks for programs to deal with is how to ensure that the nonprofessionals they employ maintain their identity and contact with the target population and at the same time understand the basically middle-class orientation of the professionals. The professional staff must strive for a balance between the two approaches.

Many professionals are reluctant to employ nonprofessionals because the supervisory responsibilities are so different from those used with other professionals or graduate students. Often the professionals are concerned about how to relate to the nonprofessional, as another worker or as a client. Others are adamant about not "watering down" their profession by using nonprofessionals.

This attitude often reflects the insecurity of some professionals about their own capabilities. Enough evidence has been gathered to show that, if properly trained and supervised, the nonprofessional worker can enhance the effectiveness of any program. In fact, the use of nonprofessionals contributes to the professionalism of regular staff by providing them with supervisory opportunities, as well as freeing them to devote more time to their professional duties.

Despite some initial negative reactions, professionals who have had experience working with nonprofessionals have been enthusiastic about their performance. But they continually raise questions of how to supervise this "new" category of worker. This obviously points up the need for an intensive study of the problem by the professional schools and associations.

When education is made meaningful for people,that is, when a relationship can be shown between education, work and personal advancement - they learn. There is real hunger in most people for learning; this becomes apparent when the milieu is right. But theoretical or vicarious learning generally can take place among disadvantaged groups only after a certain amount of success has been achieved in practical learning. This is indicated by the relatively large numbers of trainees who completed the course, went to work, and who are now planning to return to formal schooling. At the initial screening interview, only one person indicated a desire to resume her schooling.

There is a snowballing effect to this: Relatives and friends of the trainees were often influenced by them to enroll in training programs or to further their education. Husbands and wives of the trainees helped with the homework assignments; children were suddenly made aware that learning is not bad - their parents were doing it and enjoying it.

To provide people with skills so that they are ready when opportunities emerge, and to see them take advantage of those opportunities is probably the most rewarding experience one can have.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTAKE QUESTIONNAIRE
INTERVIEWER'S CASE SUMMARY

APPENDIX B: TRAINING SCHEDULE

APPENDIX C: AGENCIES PROVIDING ON-THE-JOB TRAINING STATIONS
AGENCIES PROVIDING FULL-TIME JOBS

APPENDIX D: STATISTICS

APPENDIX E: JOB DESCRIPTIONS

APPENDIX "A"

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

(Blank spaces have been omitted to conserve paper)

Heading: Interviewer, Date of Interview, Place of Interview, Time Begun, Time Ended

Face Sheet: Name, Sex, Address, Telephone Number, Social Security Number, Birth Date, Place of Birth, Citizenship, Marital Status, Number of Dependents, Family Status, Ethnicity, Employment Status, How Long Unemployed & Why, Years of Cumulative Work Experience, Highest Grade Completed, Foreign Languages

Referral Source: Referring Agency, Referring Agent, Comments of Referring Agent about Applicant

Introductory Questions:

1) What brought you to (referring agent or agency)?

2) Do you have any idea why (referring agent or agency) sent you to see us rather than to some other place?

3) What did (referring agent or agency) tell you about our program?

Program described in detail here

Work History:

4) What was the first job you ever had? How old were you? How did you come to take that job? Was it full-time or part-time? How long did you work there? What were your job duties? What was your salary? Why did you leave? What did you do then?

5) Starting with most recent job, describe: Type of firm (name and address if possible), dates of employment, hours of work, salary, duties, special skills, reason for leaving.

6) Of all the jobs you've ever had, which did you like the most? Why?

7) What kind of work would you really like to do? Why?

8) Have you ever done paid or voluntary work with an agency, group or social organization? Describe agency, dates, and duties.

9) What did you like best of all in these agencies? Why?

Education: 10) What is the highest grade in school you completed? Where? When? What kind of course did you take? Diploma or certificate? What were you preparing yourself for?

11) Have you taken any special courses or training? Where? When? Specify courses.

12) Do you intend taking any special courses or training? Where? When? Specify courses.

13) What did you like most about school?

14) Did you participate in after-school activities? What offices or positions held.

15) What didn't you like about school?

16) Why did you leave school?

17) What contacts did you have with school guidance counselors? What did they tell you?

Armed Forces: 18) Were you ever in the United States Armed Forces?

If yes: 19) Branch of Service, Dates, Highest Rank, Type of Work Performed, Type of Discharge

APPENDIX "A"

If no: 20) What is your draft classification?

Other Skills: 21) Do you have a driver's license?

22) Do you use or can you operate any office machines, shop machines, hand tools, etc.? Specify

23) Besides what we've talked about, do you have any other skills? Specify

Neighborhood: 24) Will you describe the neighborhood in which you live? (Probe for type and age range of people, housing, businesses, quiet-noisy, clean-dirty, social-antisocial behavior)

25) Do you know many people in your neighborhood? How well?

26) Do most people in your neighborhood seem to be working?

27) Do most of the young people in your neighborhood go to school? Of those who do not go to school, are they working?

28) Is there much trouble with crime, narcotics, alcohol, gangs, etc.? Specify

29) What social or community agencies are located in your neighborhood? Which of these do you belong to or have you visited? For what purpose?

Home & Family: 30) How long have you lived in New York City? How long in your present apartment? How long in your present neighborhood? Where did you live before coming to New York City?

31) How many times have you moved in the last 5 years?

32) Do you live in private house (own or rent), apartment house, hotel, rooming house, other? Describe.

33) How many rooms are there in your home? Do you have your own room?

34) Who else is in your household and family? Describe relationship, age, sex, school status, work position and where they live.

35) If separated or divorced, describe family, home,financial arrangements.

36) Is there one person in your family you'd like most to be like? Why?

37) Who would you tend to talk to when you have a serious problem? Why?

38) What outside agencies would you turn to for help with a serious problem? Why?

Health: 39) What would you say your general health is like?

40) Do you have medical coverage of any kind?

41) Do you have any physical limitations? Specify

42) When was the last time you had a medical checkup?

43) Do you have a doctor or medical clinic which you visit regularly? Specify

Legal: 44) Have you ever been in trouble with the law? Will you tell me about it? Offense, Dates, What Happened, Final Outcome

Leisure Time Activities:

45) Describe an average day in your life (probe for non-employment activities with view to attachment or disattachment to people and community.)

46) Are there things that you used to do more than you do now? What things? How come you do these less now?

APPENDIX "A"

47) Are there things you do more now than you used to do? Specify

48) Did you ever belong to any of the following organizations? Do you still belong? Church or religious organization, Labor union (specify), Political club, Civic or fraternal organization, Lodge, Sports or social club, Parent-Teacher Assn., Other (specify)

49) What offices did you hold in any of these organizations?

50) Which of the following things do you talk about often? With whom? Housing Problems, Discrimination, Juvenile Delinquency, School conditions, Crime, Politics, World Affairs, Others (specify)

51) Daydream a little bit. Imagine that the sky is the limit: What would you desire most in life? What things would you say hold you back from obtaining this? What might you do about it?

52) If you are accepted for this program, can you think of any family, personal or financial limitations that might interfere with your ability to complete the full program? (Describe program again)

53) Why are you interested in this program?

54) Do you think you'd like working in the field of youth employment

55) Why do you think you are suited to work with young people?

56) Thinking back over the interview, how would you say you felt about it? Was there anything about it which was distasteful or upsetting? Was there anything about it which was helpful?

APPENDIX "A"

INTERVIEWER'S CHECK LIST

1) Ability to communicate: (Describe particular strengths or weaknesses)

2) Relevancy (to the questions): Describe particular observations

3) Tension: (Describe degree and kind)

4) Personal Appearance: (Include dress, neatness, cleanliness, bearing, etc.)

5) Attitude toward self and own capabilities:

6) I would______would not______recommend this person for training because

APPENDIX "A"

INTERVIEWER'S CASE SUMMARY

Applicant's Name; Code Number; Referring Agency; Interviewer; Conference Date; Interview Date.

Comments of Referring Agency
Why Did Applicant Go To This Agency?

1. Identification Data:
   Age; Sex; Marital Status; Place of Birth; Family Status; Number of Dependents; Education; Years of Work Experience; Employment Status; If Unemployed, How Long?
2. Describe the appearance and behavior of the applicant.
3. Describe the educational background of the applicant.
4. Describe the work history, service experience and particular skills of the applicant.
5. Describe the neighborhood, family and home environment of the applicant with emphasis on his attitudes toward same.
6. Describe the hobbies and leisure time activities of the applicant with emphasis on attachment and disattachment to other people.
7. Describe the medical and legal aspects of the applicant's background.
8. Describe particular strengths and weaknesses not covered in other questions.
9. Interviewer's recommendation; accept, reject, reinterview.
10. Estimate types of jobs applicant could perform in youth employment programs.
11. Consensus of total staff; accept, reject, reinterview.
12. Questions which need clarification, changes, additions and deletions.

APPENDIX "B"

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

TRAINING SCHEDULE - FIRST SIX WEEKS

Week	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
I	Introductions Orientation Overview of youth employ. Distribution of materials- How Much Love Does A Child Cost - Tape	NYSES & MDTA Forms Program Design Problem Solving Approach	Characteristics of Youth Services They Need MFY Panel	MFY Field Trip Field Trip Reports	Thurstone SRA Interpersonal Value Tests Discussion of Tests & Testing
II	Interviewing Techniques Overview of anti-poverty programs in N.Y.C.	Reporting Techniques Effects of Poverty	Field Trip to P.A.L. (all day)	Youth & The Labor Market Indiv. OJT Conferences	Remediation Techniques New York City Youth Board
III	Education in N.Y.C. OJT Preparations & Assignments	O J T	Field Trip N.Y.C. Welfare Dept. OJT Reports	O J T	Film - The Dropout Job Finding Techniques
IV	Gates Reading Survey Supreme Court-Probation & Parole	O J T	OJT Reports Small group sessions on techniques of Remediation	O J T	OJT Reports Program Planning
V	Case Studies	O J T	Job Descriptions Role Playing Hidden Agenda	O J T	The Job Corps Testing Techniques
VI	Interviewing Techniques Counseling Techniques	O J T	O J T	O J T	Remediation Techniques Taping Session on Interviewing Techniques. Prof. E.S. forms

Note: ½ hour Remediation each class day
1 to 2 hours weekly on basic Spanish

APPENDIX "B"

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

TRAINING SCHEDULE - LAST SIX WEEKS

Week	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
VII	Interviewing Techniques Labor Unions	O J T	O J T	O J T	Professional E.S. Registration Interviewing
VIII	Alcohol & Narcotic Addictions Resumes	O J T	O J T	O J T	Professional E.S. Registration Remediation Techniques
IX	OJT Reports Interviewing Techniques Role-playing	O J T	O J T	O J T	Working Papers Telephone Techniques
X	Written Case Studies Industry Hiring Practices	O J T	O J T	O J T	Graduation Planning-Use of resumes Case Study Presentation
XI.	CAP Programs in Los Angeles Use of semi-professionals Attitudes of agency professionals	O J T	O J T	O J T	Case Study Evaluation The Helping Professions
XII	How We See Ourselves Project Enable-Urban League	Gates Reading Survey Recap.of Employment Situation For Aides	Written General Program Evaluation OJT Evaluation	Program Evaluations Indiv. Evaluation Conferences	GRADUATION

Note: $\frac{1}{2}$ hour Remediation each class day
1 to 2 hours weekly on basic Spanish

APPENDIX "C"

AGENCIES PROVIDING ON-THE-JOB TRAINING STATIONS

Bedford-Stuyvesant Young Men's Christian Association,
Youth & Work Project

Bronx River Neighborhood Houses

Community Council of Greater New York

East Harlem Youth Employment Service

Federation Employment & Guidance Service Sheltered Workshop

Forest Neighborhood Houses

Hudson Guild Settlement House

Job Orientation In Neighborhoods (JOIN)

Madison Square Boys Club

Mobilization For Youth

Newark Housing Authority

New York State Supreme Court - Vocational Department

Police Athletic League, Youth & Work Project

Social & Surgical Restoration Center

South East Bronx United

Springfield College Pre-Release Guidance Center

United Neighborhood Houses

Vocational Advisory Service

Young Women's Christian Association

Youth Counsel Bureau, Office of the District Attorney

Youth-In-Action

APPENDIX "C"

AGENCIES PROVIDING FULL-TIME JOBS TO TRAINEES

Bedford-Stuyvesant YMCA - New York City

Board of Education Community Centers - New York City

Brooklyn House of Detention - New York City

Brooklyn Youth Opportunity Center, New York State Employment Service

Brotherhood-In-Action - New York City

Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center - Edison, N.J.

Catholic Charities - New York City

Community Council of Greater New York

Henry Street Settlement House - New York City

Lincoln Hospital Mental Health Clinic - New York City

Madison Square Boys Club - New York City

Manhattan Youth Opportunity Center, New York State Employment Service

Mobilization For Youth - New York City

Newark Housing Authority - Newark, N.J.

New York City Department of Personnel, Neighborhood Youth Corps

New York City Mission Society

Police Athletic League - New York City

Social & Surgical Restoration Project - New York City

United Planning Organization - Washington, D.C.

United Progress Incorporated - Trenton, N.J.

Vocational Advisory Service - New York City

Youth-In-Action - New York City

APPENDIX "D"

STATISTICS

Category	1st Grp.	2nd Grp.	3rd Grp.	Total
1. Total enrolled in project	21	20	20	61
a. Sex				
1) Male	11	9	8	28
2) Female	10	11	12	33
b. Age				
1) 22-29	14	10	10	34
2) 30-39	6	7	6	19
3) 40 and over	1	3	4	8
c. Ethnicity				
1) Negro	16	16	17	49
2) White	0	0	1	1
3) Other (Puerto Rican, Cuban, Haitian)	5	4	2	11
d. Education				
1) 9th & 10th	2	3	4	9
2) 11th	1	2	2	5
3) 12th (high school grads)	11	8	8	27
4) Over 12th	7	7	6	20
e. Marital Status				
1) Single	10	4	7	21
2) Married	7	9	2	18
3) Separated & Divorced	4	5	10	19
4) Widowed	0	2	1	3
f. Head of household or family	13	14	18	45
g. Police Record	3	2	4	9
2. Number dropped by program	1	0	1	2
3. Voluntary dropouts	0	0	0	0
4. Number completed training	20	20	19	59

APPENDIX "D"

Category	1st Grp.	2nd Grp.	3rd Grp.	Total
	N=20	N=20	N=19	N=59
5. Placement Record				
a. Number working full-time in jobs related to training	14	14	8	36
b. Number working full-time in jobs unrelated to training	2	1	2	5
c. Number working part-time or in temporary jobs related to training	0	0	0	0
d. Number working part-time or in temporary jobs unrelated to training	1	0	2	3
e. Number going to school full-time	1	0	0	1
f. Number unemployed	1	3	7	11
g. Number lost contact	1	1	0	2
h. Number deceased	0	1	0	1

APPENDIX "E"

PROFESSIONAL AIDE IN YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Job Description

D.O.T. Code Number:	0-27.52
D.O.T. Title:	Professional Aide
Alternate Titles:	Subprofessional, Semiprofessional, Nonprofessional
Promotion To:	Supervisor of Professional Aides, Assistant to Section Supervisor, Department Head
Promotion From:	Recreation Aide, Trainee, Clerk, Volunteer
Duties:	May perform some or all of the following duties executed under the direction of a professional worker:

The professional aide gathers information relating to youth and their employment by visiting their homes and interviewing them and/or their parents. He acts as a reception and intake worker for new clients reporting to the agency. He assists counselors by administering structured interviews and questionnaires and discussing the findings with other staff members. He assists teachers or professional remediation workers in tutoring individuals or small groups in reading and mathematics. He supervises groups of youth in the performance of certain maintenance, clerical or laboring tasks. He assists psychometrists in administering and evaluating a variety of tests or work samples. He canvasses employers by phone, mail or in person to locate possible job openings for youth and refers youth for interviews. He visits youth on the job or in training situations to discover progress and uncover problems. He recruits youth for the program by approaching them in the street or in areas where they congregate. He teaches specific skills in certain limited areas. He provides written reports to his supervisor on his activities. He attends all regular staff meetings, seminars and training sessions.

Responsibility For Policy: May make policy recommendations with respect to the functioning of the program to his immediate supervisor.

APPENDIX "E"

Responsibility For Work Of Others: May assign and supervise work of other aides, youth, clerical employees, and volunteers.

Training: Much of the training for this position must be obtained on the job. Some formal classroom training is also recommended dealing with the culture of disadvantaged youth; communication skills - observation, reporting, interviewing; and the structure and goals of youth employment programs.

Working Hours: Regular agency or program hours.

Qualifications For Employment:

Age:	22 years of age and older
Sex:	Male or female
Education:	No formal education required. Completion of a related training program is helpful.
Experience:	Volunteer or paid work in a social agency or program is helpful. Prior work with youth is also helpful.
Personal Qualities:	Maturity, motivation, inquisitiveness, enthusiasm, ability to relate to different people, native intelligence, and initiative.
Special Knowledge:	An ability to communicate orally and in writing with professionals and with youth. Familiarity with the local labor market situation. A knowledge of community resources and referral agencies.

APPENDIX "E"

Field Representative

D.O.T. Code Number: 0-27.52

D.O.T. Title: Professional Aide

Alternative Titles: Outreach worker, Family and Agency Visiting Aide, Follow-Up Aide, On-the Job Training Aide, Neighborhood Aide

Duties:

1) To locate, contact and recruit youths who have not been served by agencies in the community, or who may have graduated from or dropped out of agency or community programs.

2) To secure specific information useful in developing an understanding of family problems and relationships related to the selection, training, and placement of youth by interviewing youth and their families.

3) To gather needed information through visits to schools, health, and social welfare agencies.

4) To accompany youth, individuals or groups, to assigned training facilities, job stations, for medicals or interviews.

5) To visit sites where youth are training or working, maintaining contact with both youth and employers.

6) To supervise and keep time sheets for youth on the job.

7) To secure job descriptions from participating agencies.

8) To provide necessary information to professional staff with tentative recommendations for action.

APPENDIX "E"

Placement Aide

D.O.T. Code Number: 0-27.52

D.O.T. Title Professional Aide

Alternate Titles: Employer Contact Aide, Telephone Contact Aide, Canvasser

Duties:

1) To approach employers and to enlist them in providing jobs for training and employment purposes.
2) To canvass employers in a particular neighborhood.
3) To canvass particular kinds of employers in a number of neighborhoods.
4) To develop openings for particular youth
5) To telephone employers about openings
6) To establish job titles and code numbers for youth utilizing D.O.T.

APPENDIX "E"

Work Crew Leader, Assistant Work Crew Leader

D.O.T. Code Number: 0-27.52

D.O.T. Title: Professional Aide

Alternate Titles: Group Work Aide, Maintenance Aide, Crew Chief

Duties:

1) To supervise or assist in the supervision of a group of youths engaged in construction, renovation, repair, maintenance or clean-up activities.
2) To keep attendance, production and supply records.
3) To arrange for necessary supplies and equipment.
4) To set up procedure and job assignments for individual youth.
5) To develop and administer evaluation tests.

APPENDIX "E"

Case Aide

D.O.T. Code Number: 0-27.52

D.O.T. Title: Professional Aide

Alternate Titles: Reception and Intake Aide, Counseling Aide, Testing Aide, Research Aide.

Duties:

1) To receive youth coming into the agency or program office, ascertaining their needs and directing them accordingly.
2) To obtain and record preliminary information and data.
3) To describe the program to new applicants.
4) To administer structured interviews.
5) To administer or help administer tests.
6) To help in group counseling and role-playing sessions.
7) To contact youth and their families by phone to give or receive information.
8) To exerpt and record information on youth from different reports, tests and other sources.
9) To conduct surveys by administering structured questionnaires.
10) To assist in the gathering, recording and analyzing of coded research data and statistics.

APPENDIX "E"

Teacher Aide

D.O.T. Code Number: 0-27.52

D.O.T. Title: Professional Aide

Alternate Titles: Tutor Aide, Remedial Aide, Technical Aide

Duties:

1) To help supervise and instruct youth in academic and work training programs.
2) To help develop curriculum materials and techniques for instruction.
3) To obtain and operate visual aids and other equipment or supplies.
4) To keep attendance, progress and other records.
5) To assist in maintaining order.
6) To instruct groups or individual youth needing remedial help.
7) To administer remedial and other tests.
8) To develop and prepare word lists for different grade levels.
9) To teach English to non-English speaking youths.
10) To aid youth prepare for civil service, apprenticeship and other examinations.
11) To teach job preparation skills (how to dress, how to complete applications, how to behave in an interview).
12) To teach specific skills when applicable.